DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 526 CE 058 755

AUTHOR Solorzano, Ronald W.; And Others
TITLE Reducing Illiteracy in California: Review of Effective Practices in Adult Literacy Programs. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Pasadena, CA.
SPONS AGENCY California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 247p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; Community Organizations; *Cost Effectiveness; Dropout Prevention; Dropouts; Educational Planning; Illiteracy; Libraries; Library Extension; *Literacy Education; National Surveys; Program Administration; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; School Holding Power; State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Student Recruitment; Testing; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A study identified the most effective and low cost programs currently in operation and described in adult literacy literature that would significantly reduce adult illiteracy in California by 1994. Recommendations were made for a statewide plan to replicate those programs in communities throughout the state. A literature review focused on eight program areas: methods and materials; testing and evaluation; outreach and recruitment; learner retention; program management; international literacy efforts; and replication. A telephone survey collected additional data on program practices and impact from a sample of effective literacy service providers. Comparable data were obtained from 67 adult literacy programs, representing adult basic education, community colleges, libraries, and community based organizations. Onsite visits were made to four of the programs. The literature review, telephone survey, and site visits revealed a variety of programs offering a variety of services. A discussion under the title "Replication" explores the essential conditions that agencies must meet in order to replicate successful practices. Results showed that materials should be adult centered and related to learners' goals. Most programs used tests but were unhappy with them. Ongoing evaluation of learner progress was important to subsequent success. Ongoing program evaluation, networking, and dropout prevention were also important. (Appendixes include project correspondence, instruments, and list of 71 successful adult literacy programs. A 193-item bibliography is provided.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED335526

REDUCING ILLITERACY IN CALIFORNIA: REVIEW OF EFFECTIVE PRACTICES IN ADULT LITERACY PROGRAMS

Final Report

Submitted to

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Adult Education Division

1989

Ronald W. Solorzano, Ph.D.
Project Director

Brian M. Stecher, Ph.D.
Project Analyst

Monte Perez, Ph.D.
Project Associate

Educational Testing Service
Pasadena, California

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Solorzano

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE058755

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Notice

This report was developed under a state-administered grant from the California State Department of Education, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California, 95814. However, the contents do not necessarily reflect the position or policies of that Department, and no official endorsement of this should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Part I: Review of the Literature	3
Instructional Methods and Materials	5
Testing and Evaluation	40
Outreach and Recruitment	51
Learner Retention	58
Program Management	65
International Literacy Efforts	74
Part II: Telephone Survey	90
Part III: Onsite Visits	124
Replication	133
Discussion of Results	139
Recommendations	141
Bibliography	142
Appendices	156

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A study of this size could not have been done without the help of many people. First, I want to acknowledge the State Department of Education, Adult Education Division staff, and in particular, Ray Eberhard and Juliet Crutchfield for their support during this study.

My colleagues from ETS, Princeton Office, Gita Wilder and Caryn Ashare helped with the telephone interviews and site visits and provided meaningful feedback on drafts of instruments used in this study. A special thanks goes to Jerome Murphy from the ETS Office of Corporate Planning and Development for his support of this project.

I want to thank the research assistants: Laura Telles, Robert Salcido, Vince Quitoriano, Ernesto Ballesteros, and John Meek for gathering numerous articles and performing other important tasks related to this study.

I also want to thank Virginia Vandagriff and Steve McBrearty for editing the manuscript. Frank Romero, Director of the Pasadena Field Office, assisted with the telephone survey and site visits.

The Project Statewide Advisory Committee was also supportive, providing materials and suggestions throughout the study. This committee met once as a group and provided valuable input relative to replication issues and recommendations referred to in this report.

Last, but certainly not least, I want to thank the staff from the adult literacy sites that agreed to participate in this study in the spirit of sharing information and effective program practices with other literacy programs. Because of their unselfish sharing of these effective practices, this information can be furnished to other literacy programs in the hope of providing ideas on how to offer high quality services to adult learners.

Ronald W. Solorzano
Project Director

INTRODUCTION

Final Report
State Department of Education
Reducing Illiteracy in California:
A Review of Effective Practices
in Adult Literacy Programs

INTRODUCTION

This study was conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) Pasadena Field Office on behalf of the California State Department of Education (SDE), in response to an RFP whose purpose was twofold: 1) to identify the most effective and low cost programs currently in operation and described in adult literacy research that will significantly reduce adult illiteracy in California by 1994 and, 2) make recommendations for a statewide plan to replicate those programs in communities throughout the state. In discussing the replication issues, the study considers replicating effective practices among four service delivery areas: 1) community colleges, 2) adult schools (ABE programs), 3) libraries, and 4) Community Based Organizations (CBO's). These categories are not inclusive of the various adult programs providing services (e.g., correctional institutions, JTPA programs, etc.), but were included for the purposes of this study.

In order to address the issues raised in this Request For Proposal (RFP), ETS staff developed a research design to include the following three components:

Background Data:

* review of the literature

Empirical Data:

* nationwide telephone survey of exemplary adult literacy programs
* site visits to exemplary adult literacy programs

This report will present the results of an extensive review of the literature from various sources on selected program components referred to in the initial RFP and other components identified by ETS. Complementing the review of the literature will be a special section on international literacy efforts.

Supplementing the review of the literature will be a presentation of the Telephone Survey results -- again relative to the effective program components outlined in the initial RFP and others identified by ETS project staff.

Following the presentation of results of the Telephone Survey will be a discussion on the Site Visits.

In the final section of the report, replication issues will be discussed and recommendations made on how these findings can be incorporated into the state's adult education five year plan. To assist us in responding to this section, additional information was gathered from the statewide project

advisory committee who shared reports and other materials, as well as their thoughts on replication issues with the project staff at a one-day meeting held in ETS' Pasadena Field Office.

PART I:

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

I. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In addressing the concerns of the RFP relative to the literature review, it is important to note that the review will document information from the following three sources:

1. reports on adult literacy programs that have been identified as effective by the authors of the report,

2. journal articles from experts in the field of adult literacy who are addressing the issues identified in the SDE's RFP,

3. other materials (e.g., state evaluations, unpublished reports/documents, papers presented at adult literacy conferences) that address the areas identified in the RFP.

The literature review will be organized to follow the eight program areas identified in the SDE's RFP. Sub-questions from each category will also be addressed during the literature review. Where appropriate, certain sub-questions were combined in the report. That is, there was overlap between certain categories. Also, ETS project staff added research questions deemed beneficial to the findings of the report. All the categories and sub-questions -- as they appear in the RFP -- are listed below with additional categories added by ETS project staff highlighted.

Methods and Materials

What instructional methods do programs use?
Pedagogy and Andragogy as appropriate theories for teaching adults
Incorporating learners' goals in the instructional setting
Recognizing the learners' perception of the reading and writing process
How is instruction targeted to meet the unique needs of the English language majority groups and the language minority populations?
Importance of ESL learners' background
Identifying ESL learners' reading strategies
Technology and Adult Literacy Instruction
What materials do programs use for:
a. native English speaker;
b. language minority groups illiterate in the primary language and English;
c. language minority groups illiterate in English and literate in the primary language?
How are materials selected?

Testing and Evaluation

Are learners pre- and post-tested?
Which tests are used for pre- and post-testing?
How is ongoing learner performance monitored?
How is the total program evaluated?
What specific elements make a successful local program?

Outreach and Recruitment

- How do the "hard-to-reach" illiterate adults find out about the literacy programs?
- How are the nonliterate language majority and language minority populations recruited?
- What media or printed material strategies do programs use to recruit volunteer tutors, community groups, social service agencies, and other support services that will benefit the learner?
- What different kinds of outreach and recruiting activities do programs use? What activities are more effective than others in bringing and keeping the "hard-to-reach"?

Learner Retention

- For what reasons do learners remain in programs?
- For what reasons do learners leave or quit programs?

Program Management

- What kinds of fiscal and human resources do programs have?
- What are the actual costs of maintaining successful programs?
- What are the leadership qualities of those who manage the program?
- How are fiscal and human resources managed so that resources are aligned and not in conflict between English as a second language programs and literacy services for the native English speaker?
- What is the per-student hour cost of the program?
- What is the per-teacher hour cost of the program?

International Literacy Efforts

- Current approaches to teaching literacy
- Literacy programs in Latin America
- Literacy programs in industrialized nations
- Women's role in literacy efforts

Replication

- What essential conditions must local agencies meet in order to replicate the effective programs?
- What materials and resources need to be made available for replication of the programs at the local level, at a statewide level?
- What would it cost to conduct all diffusion activities for each identified program?

Procedures

Three computer searches were conducted related to adult education effective practices. In addition, project staff solicited the assistance of the ETS Princeton Library to secure inter-library loans from various libraries to acquire materials that have been archived or discontinued. Since much of the data related to adult literacy practices is contained in reports, unpublished reports and evaluations, papers delivered at conferences etc., they were ordered directly from Educational Resource Information Center (ERIC) or obtained directly from the authors themselves.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS AND MATERIALS

Instructional Methods and Materials

This section begins with a discussion of instructional methods used in adult literacy programs or suggested in the literature as being effective practices. Following this discussion will be a review of effective practices relative to materials.

Methods

Introduction. Before discussing methods of teaching adults, three issues related to teaching strategies come to mind. These issues are mentioned here because they impact the instructional delivery system. The issues reviewed below are the following:

* inclusion of the theory of andragogy (how adults learn)
* the degree to which learner goals are considered in the instructional process, and
* learner and teacher perceptions of what reading is

In many respects, how literacy programs address these issues reflects their instructional strategies. For this reason, they are considered important to the discussion on methods and materials.

Pedagogy vs. Andragogy. The discussion as to which methods are best for teaching reading has loomed for many years. In a sense, little differentiation has been made between strategies for educating adults and educating children. For instance, many school-based traditions in learner assessment (e.g., grade levels), modes of instruction (e.g., classroom based), and reading materials have been carried over from the k-12 traditions. Yet, for adult education, these traditions may not be appropriate. Mocker (1975) emphasizes the need for movement away from the pedagogy used with children (Quoted in Norman & Malicky, 1984).

Even though many have suggested a unique instructional delivery system for adults (Knowles, 1980; Boraks & Schumacher, 1981), Norman and Malicky (1984) state, "The most common type of adult literacy program both in the past and at the present is developmental in nature, incorporating the approaches and often even materials used with children." (p. 92) Harman (1984) states the issue as follows, "Are adult illiterates, from the point of view of the patterns which dictate their acquisition of reading skills at both basic and more advanced levels similar to children several decades younger or do they require different instructional approaches and curricula?" (p. 33). This issue will be discussed below.

Some suggest that teaching reading is the same for adults and children, therefore research is borrowed from effective pedagogical methods used with school age learners. Bowren and Zintz (1987) state that although teaching strategies may be different, "Reading develops in an orderly, sequential pattern regardless of the learner's age." Forester (1988) notes that when "Using a language-learning model as [a] theoretical foundation during inclass research, first in elementary school settings (Forester, 1975, 1977), and then

with college students (Forester, 1980), [the data] revealed remarkable parallels in the processes at work in acquiring literacy."

Others recommend, however, that "andragogy" and not "pedagogy" is more appropriate when referring to instructional strategies for adults (Bowren, 1987; Knowles, 1980). In this case, adults are seen as possessing substantial background experiences, coping methods and built-in strategies that make them more adept at learning to read. Knowles (1980) suggests that the most important characteristic of adult learners is that they are capable of self-direction. Yet, some note that perhaps field-independent learners embody the philosophy that adults are self-directed; field-dependent learners may still need help developing strategies for structuring their learning (Even, 1982).

In either case, it is not clear whether the different learning styles of adults result in better or worse performance compared to children at similar grade levels. For example, based on comparisons of adults and children reading at the fifth grade reading level, Sticht (1982) cautioned that one should not assume that adult literacy students will perform better or learn more quickly than children at comparable reading levels. Mikulecky (1986), cites the work of Leibert (1983) where the author found that for children (reading at comparable low levels as adults), accuracy and rate decreased as passages became more difficult, whereas adult readers demonstrated no comparable variability in accuracy but similar declines in rate. (p. 23). Buchanan and Sherman (1981) suggest that adults do not learn in a rigidly fixed continuum, nor do their skills develop in a predictable hierarchy, thus further suggesting that traditional teaching methods used with children would not be appropriate with adults.

The different learning styles and reading strategies of adults must be researched further. Malicky and Norman (1982) suggest -- based on their study of reading strategies and "correctional behavior" related to "semantically unacceptable errors" -- that "These results support the argument that differences between children and adults are sufficiently great to indicate that the pedagogy of teaching reading to children is not appropriate for the teaching of adults." (p. 735). In another study (Malicky & Norman, 1982) the authors note that "... it has been recognized that the differences between children and adults are sufficiently great that the methods and materials for teaching children to read are not appropriate for the teaching of adults." (p. 61).

Some even suggest that physical factors related to adults need to be taken into consideration. For instance, Longfield suggests, "Since adults do not see, hear, or react as quickly as children, they require more time for reaction and more practice for performance." (p. 18).

Crandall, Lerche, and Marchilonis, (1984) found in their survey of effective programs that literacy educators have very different views of the cognitive psychological and social factors that influence adult learning. Some adult literacy programs are modeled on public school instruction, while others argue that this model is inappropriate for the adult learner. A closer picture of the learning patterns of adults, and an understanding of the nature of literacy practice that matches these learning patterns would assist

literacy educators in designing more relevant instructional programs. (p. 337).

Thus, based on assumptions on how adults learn, programs must determine how they will organize their instructional program, and this must be done at the beginning of instruction. As one national report suggests, good literacy providers assess the student's background knowledge, skills, and experience at orientation before planning lessons (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). An understanding of adults strengths and differences relative to instructional delivery, may be the deciding factor -- not only in keeping adults in the program -- but in teaching them to read and write.

Incorporating Adults' Goals in the Instructional Process. Another important consideration for instructional practice is the extent to which learners' goals are incorporated into the instructional setting. That is, how should methods relate to learner goals, background experiences, and needs, and to what extent should learners be involved in the planning of their own instruction? Adults join and stay in literacy programs because they believe that they will benefit from what they learn. Simply being literate is not always the adult's motivation for coming to the literacy program, although literacy is usually necessary for accomplishing the goal (U.S. Department of Education, 1988).

In some cases, program goals are not the same as learner goals. Johnson (1985) points out that "... client goals are not necessarily the same as program goals or those legislatively mandated and easily quantified." (p. 19). Yet incorporating learner goals into the instructional setting is necessary. As Phillips, Bellorado, and Robinson, (1985) note, "Much of the recent literature points out that student motivation and academic achievement are highest where interaction between staff and student are learner-centered as opposed to program-centered." (p. 2). The authors identify three types of programs, 1) those emphasizing academic and job skills, 2) those programs emphasizing human development goals and, 3) those emphasizing empowerment. The authors found in their review of 15 exemplary programs that the decision as to which methods or materials to be used during instruction depends on the program's orientation to literacy.

In a study which analyzed information from a "response group" of 20 national service providers, Mayer (1985) outlined characteristics of effective adult literacy programs. He notes that, in regard to instruction, "a literacy program should choose its instructional strategies and materials to help each adult learner progress towards his/her learning goals." Similarly, Padak and Padak (1987) suggest that for adult basic reading programs, instruction should be based on theoretical knowledge about the reading process (which according to the authors should be comprehension-based); should address the adult's affective needs; and, be personally satisfying for the adult.

Crandall et al. (1984) after surveying 168 adult literacy programs, noted that "our discussion of instructional methods and materials illustrates that the only sure direction is one that is focused on learner needs and interests."(p. 221). However, these same authors found while examining

assessment practices of programs in their sample that, "[Learner] Interest or vocational inventories and learning style assessments are rare. This is surprising considering the frequency with which educators mention tailoring instruction to student interests and learning style." (p. 162).

Although many literacy programs state that they are learner centered, many, in reality, do not involve the learner in the instructional process. In a study by Wurzbacher and Yeannakis (1986), it was reported that volunteer projects did not adequately involve students in the planning, operation and evaluation of the literacy project. Thus including the adult learner in instructional planning is of great importance if programs expect to keep their attendance up. To insure that learners' goals can be addressed by the program the U.S. Department of Education study on adult literacy recommends the following six suggestions:

1) Find out why students have come to the program.
2) Make sure the students participate in setting the goals.
3) Give students a realistic picture of the time it will take to accomplish their goals.
4) Avoid false promises.
5) Acknowledge the courage that the adults have shown in coming forward.
6) Refer prospective students to another site in the community that can meet their expectations if the mission or capabilities of your literacy program can't.

Clearly, therefore, learner goals and interests should be at the forefront of literacy instruction. If learners' reasons for participating in literacy programs is not addressed, they will make little progress and eventually drop out. Some programs -- mentioned below -- base instruction exclusively on learners' interest by using methods ranging from the Language Experience Approach, to a sequenced structured phonics based approach or some combination of both.

Perceptions of the reading process. Research suggests that learners' perceptions of what constitutes reading plays a role in their eventual reading progress. The question becomes, Does one adapt instruction to meet these learner perceptions or do teachers/tutors attempt to change the learner's perception of reading to fit the program's instructional method or philosophy of reading acquisition? For example, there is evidence that learners may have a decoding perception of reading (sounding out the words) or a meaning-getting focus (understanding what the sentence/paragraph is saying). Hall, Richardson and Ramig (1976) found that "adult students often define reading as decoding, or getting the letters..." This finding is similar to other research as well (Taylor, Wade, Jackson, Blum & Goold, 1980).

Raisner (1978) investigated the reading miscues of 14 nonproficient readers at a state college and found that the adults relied heavily on graphophonic (relationship between letters and sounds) information. Some suggest that this perception of reading may actually hold back the learner from trying to read a complete passage feeling that being able to sound out all the words is a prerequisite to understanding the text (Forester, 1988).

Boraks and Schumacher (1981) also noted that "Perhaps the skill focus itself [decoding] misleads the adult beginning reader (ABR) who may come to think they can read if they have learned specific decoding skills." (p. 10).

Meyer and Keefe, (1980), examined the reading models that 100 adults used in reading and reported that the "...disabled adult reader views reading as a task involving sound and word identification." (p. 120). The authors caution, however, "...remember that the model of reading the adult reader has in his/her head may be the disabler. Limited evidence with our one-hundred subjects has revealed that those few readers in adult reading programs who have a meaning model of reading in their heads are the learners who are making significant progress." (p. 124).

In many cases, the meaning of reading that instructors have in their heads is important to the learners' instructional experience also. When Meyer and Keefe (1985) surveyed 106 ABE and 42 GED instructors using the DeFord Theoretical Orientation to the Reading Process (TORP) they found that "More than twice as many ABE instructors scored in the phonics model range than did the GED instructors." The authors recommend that "ABE and GED instructors must see reading as a meaning making process if they wish their students to obtain maximum results in reading growth."(p. 136).

Therefore, programs may need to consider how the learner (and perhaps the teacher) perceives the reading and writing process and determine if these perceptions are creating barriers to subsequent literacy improvement.

An understanding of these three aspects of adult learners -- andragogy, incorporating learners' goals into the instructional delivery systems, and identifying learners' perceptions of the reading process -- can have a profound impact on learner outcomes. In sum, an understanding of how adults learn, why they want to learn, and what they think learning is, can help programs design appropriate interventions that can make a difference in learners' subsequent literacy improvement.

What Instructional Methods do Programs Use?

The instructional methods used by a program are related to that program's particular philosophy of adult literacy. As Valentine (1986) suggests, "...general literacy can be expressed solely in terms of an individual's reading and writing ability without considering the broader social context, while functional literacy must be expressed as an individual's reading and writing ability in relation to the reading and writing tasks imposed by, or existing in, the environment in which that individual resides and seeks to function." (p. 109). These definitions are similar to those proposed by Hunter and Harman (1979), in which they make the distinction between "Conventional Literacy" and "Functional Literacy."

After deciding on the philosophical approaches, instruction can be addressed. In this sense, the adult literacy field is grappling with the same concerns that the K-12 educational system has for decades, i.e., whether to provide instruction to learners using a phonics-based or whole language-based approach. Advocates of the phonics approaches cite years of evidence in successful teaching of children to read (Chall, 1989), whereas others refute

such claims and argue for a more holistic language-based approach (Marie Carbo, 1988).

Crandall et al. (1984) surveyed 168 adult literacy programs nationwide and gathered data on the various methods that programs used. They found "two distinct approaches" to reading instruction for adults that treat reading as either a "sequential skills" approach or a "language-based" approach. In explaining the phonetic approach, the authors suggest that the technique is like "assembling a car." It is essential that each worker insert his part at exactly the right stage in the assembly process." The authors state that this example is assumed to be similar to reading; "small incremental steps, or skills, are identified which lead to the ultimate goal of reading comprehension."

The phonetic approach, also called a "bottom up" or "text-driven" approach (Goodman, 1979), implies that the most important task is decoding sound-symbol relationships (Pearson & Kamil, 1978; Gough, 1976).

On the other hand, Crandall et al. (1984) note that the language-based approach is "Like learning to talk ... given enough exposure to real language, with some specific 'helps' along the way, the adult will finally integrate the information and use the necessary processes to gain meaning from print." The "top-down" theory is considered "reader-driven" where the reader operates actively without dependence on the text (Goodman, 1979).

These illustrations of adult reading instruction are similar to those identified by Balmuth (1987). In her review and analysis of effective adult literacy programs, she states that, "In general, the methods that have been identified in the ABE studies have tended to be either carefully structured and sequenced on the one hand, with a strong phonics component or, on the other hand, less structured, informal, and with incidental phonics." These distinctions parallel the above-mentioned review of the predominant approaches to teaching reading.

For example, in California, many of the library-based programs in the California Literacy Campaign use Laubach materials to monitor learner progress (Solorzano & Stecher, 1987). This phonetic based approach appears to be popular with volunteer tutors because it is sequenced and "layed-out" in a series of skillbooks where both tutors and learners can easily track progress. On the other hand, programs that adhere to the Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) stress the language approach to reading.

Some programs find teaching both life skills and basic skills is beneficial to the learner. In this case, some form of competency-based instruction is used. Crandall et al. (1984) noted in their survey of adult literacy programs that competency-based instruction "is not a method, but an instructional management system...which combines diagnosis, instruction, assessment, and evaluation." The authors continue, "competency based systems can be 'home grown' or pre-packaged." (p. 3-89).

One competency-based system used by adult literacy programs in California receiving federal Section 306 funds is the Comprehensive Adult

Student Assessment System (CASAS). According to Rickard (1988), "CASAS is a comprehensive curriculum management and assessment system designed to provide agencies with effective assessment materials and procedures for all levels of Adult Basic Education (ABE), English as a Second Language (ESL), Pre-employment and high school completion programs for adult and secondary students." (p. 1). The CASAS system was accepted as exemplary by the National Diffusion Network and has been implemented in at least 150 programs in California who are receiving federal Adult Basic Education Act 306 funds. Preliminary results of data for learners participating in programs using this system indicate that after approximately 100 hours of instruction, "on average, students gain 6-7 scale score points, or achieve approximately one-half a standard deviation..." (p. 6).

Another competency-based system (also accepted by the National Diffusion Network as exemplary) was developed by the Adult Performance Level Project. This project, commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education in 1970 was initiated to "establish standards of functional competency which are free of school-based notions of literacy." (Kazemek, 1985). One aspect of functional competency is defined as "two-dimensional and involves the application of a set of skills (reading, writing, speaking/listening, computing, and problem solving, to a set of knowledge areas; consumer economics, occupational knowledge, health, community resources, and government and law." (p. 24).

Tied to instructional methods is the nature of the delivery system for providing that instruction. The different arrangements include one-on-one tutoring/teaching, small group instruction or classroom-based teaching (Crandall et al. 1984; SRA, 1987). Most ABE and community college programs use the whole classroom approach; library-based literacy programs normally use one-on-one tutoring; and community-based organizations use a combination of one-on-one tutoring and small group instruction.

The one-on-one approach allows the learner to receive individual attention from a tutor to work on specific skills and needs, whereas the small group gives learners an opportunity to interact with each other and share ideas and experiences. Opponents of the one-on-one method suggest that it isolates the learner and places a stigma on him/her because they are illiterate. Opponents of the group instruction methods note that learners are not getting the individual attention they need to improve their literacy skills.

The benefits and shortcomings of individualized and group learning have been debated for years. As Crandall et al. (1984) note, "Some educators feel passionately about individualized instruction while others support and defend group instruction." It's difficult to judge which method is best. Clearly, however, a committed program staff and teacher/tutor can make either work best for the learner.

In this section, a preview of various instructional approaches used in adult literacy programs has been presented. This reflects the variety of programs offering literacy services. The next section will discuss the research relative to the various approaches and discuss its impact on adults.

How is Instruction Targeted to Meet the Needs of the English Language Majority Groups?

Even though the authors above suggest the general use of phonetic and language-based approaches in adult literacy programs, there are instructional methods that specify certain procedures to use with adults that programs have used and have found to be successful. Therefore, the approaches presented below will include phonics and language-based approaches as well as teaching strategies identified in the literature by adult literacy practitioners and from studies conducted of literacy programs.

Some suggest that a phonics-based approach for older students should not be downplayed and that this approach's contribution to the reading process is actually misunderstood (Lewkowicz, 1987). The author suggests that "decoding is a comprehension skill, which contributes to comprehension not only at the word level, but also at the sentence, paragraph, and whole-text levels." (p. 51).

Phonetic approaches -- when used with carefully sequenced materials -- have shown success for low-literate adults. For example, in a Community Based Organization in Ohio, Pasch and Oakley (1985) found that learners improved 1 grade level after 50 hours of instruction using Laubach Way to Reading materials. Similar results were found in South Carolina (Quickel & Wise, 1982). In this study -- a joint effort between the local Literacy Council and school district in Horry County -- non-reading and poor reading adults were tutored by volunteers using the Laubach method. Improvement in reading levels was noted based on scores from the Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE).

Rather than viewing phonics and language-based instruction as an "either-or" situation, phonics or decoding -- as it relates to learners' reading strategies -- could be seen as an initial strategy or preliminary step towards achieving subsequent comprehension skills. At that later point, new strategies will eventually be needed for the learner to achieve higher levels of comprehension.

One study suggests this might be the case (Malicky & Norman, 1982). These researchers investigated the reading strategies used by "adult illiterates" in an adult basic education setting and analyzed these strategies relative to gains made while participating in the adult basic education program. Specifically, the authors studied entry level reading strategies used by both adult illiterates who did and those who did not make progress in an adult basic education program, and the changes in reading strategies learners made over time as they received literacy instruction. Using the Reading Miscue Inventory (Goodman & Burke, 1972) the authors studied three miscue categories: 1) Graphophonic, 2) Grammatical and, 3) Semantic. The results showed that, "the no-gain subjects entered the treatment period with heavier reliance on the graphophonic cueing system (attending more closely to letters and words) and less reliance on the grammatical system than did the high gain group."

In relation to changes in reading strategies, the no gain group showed decreased reliance on graphophonic cues and increased use of the grammatical cueing system. By the end of the treatment period, the profile of strategies

used by the no gain group was highly similar to that of the gain group at the latter group's time of entry. The authors conclude that "many students who entered the program with heavy attention to graphic cues and limited use of their knowledge of the language structure needed to reverse this emphasis before they were able to make progress on comprehension measures." (p. 735).

Since, according to Balmuth (1987), evidence in favor of direct decoding instruction at the very early levels of reading is well documented, perhaps once these learners begin increasing their literacy levels, they need to build their comprehension skills. Remaining in a phonics-based program may be sending the wrong message to the learner about the reading process. As Jones (1981) notes, "...the adult basic reader tends to think of reading as a process of decoding with precise accuracy ... as a consequence, he is apt to feel ... that he cannot read a passage in which he cannot identify each word." (p. 81). This problem also occurs with learners' perceptions of writing -- since they feel that they cannot write unless they can spell each word (Forester, 1988).

However, not all programs use solely phonics-based programs. For instance, Crandall et al. (1984) note in their survey of 213 adult literacy programs that "some educators feel strongly that pure phonics has limited success with adult learners." They go on to identify three reasons: " 1) most students in adult literacy programs have already 'failed' with phonics in school; 2) phonics is too abstract and too removed from the 'real world' of reading; 3) phonics is too laborious."

Perhaps this is one reason why adult literacy programs use a combination of phonics and comprehension strategies for instructing adults (Koen & Musemeci, 1984). When phonics is combined with language-based approaches, some success is incurred. For example, in a three-year study in Jefferson County Kentucky, Darling (1981) noted that "The most beneficial adult literacy curriculum should revolve around a sound, proven basic series, which includes decoding and comprehension skills presented in a sequential manner..."

Taylor et al. (1980) suggest that incorporating both the decoding process and comprehension activities helps learners become better readers. However, in their study, they reported that "low literate" students stated that such instructional techniques as "sounding out words" were the most effective for their reading progress." The authors suggest that some poor readers "seemed to define reading as decoding proficiency." For instance, some learners felt that if they worked on vowel sounds and syllables, they would become better readers. (p. 72). The authors note, however, that a somewhat larger group appeared to reflect a different perception of reading. They knew that in addition to the decoding process they needed to have an understanding of the meaning that the print was conveying. (p. 73). This again underlines the importance of learners' perceptions of the reading process and its effect on their subsequent reading progress.

Others suggest that instructional methods should allow adults to focus their attention on the information communicated by what they're reading rather than solely on the technical skills of reading and writing. For instance, authors of the U.S. Department of Education's study Adult Literacy: Building

Programs That Work, suggests a place for phonics instruction coupled with a need to place words in a meaningful context as well. The authors state that "Getting at the information is often the motivation [of learners] for overcoming reading difficulties. Even in basic literacy programs, which should include phonics instruction, the words students learn should be placed as early as possible in a context that is significant to them." (p. 30).

Teaching the adult beginning reader is indeed a challenging task and many programs can use suggestions on successful instructional strategies. Boraks and Richardson (1981) have suggested the following eight practices for teaching reading to the Adult Beginning Reader (ABR):

1) Teachers should help adults manage their time for maximum reading practice with minimal lesson time.

2) Initial reading instruction may be best presented with materials in which adults have expressed a utilitarian interest.

3) Adults must interact with the greater social/cultural environment to encourage more generalization in dealing with print.

4) Adults should be encouraged to identify and organize their own approach to word recognition.

5) Students will comprehend better when they can focus on the organization of the materials.

6) Instruction should not stress the abstract (letter/sound) aspect of the reading process.

7) Features or word cues most likely to be present when recall is required should be stressed when new materials are introduced.

8) Adults may learn more quickly using materials representing a relatively concrete level of experience.

The authors suggest that "we know ABRs are practiced and drilled, not taught (i.e., passive not active); and that ABRs, indeed adult non-proficient readers at all levels, view and process words as visual or phonemic units not semantic units..." (p. 2). Therefore the authors recommend instructional practices that "a) broaden the social/cultural context of the learner, b) help the ABR become an active learner and c) stress reading as a meaning process."

Stressing "reading as meaning" has been supported by previous research (Meyer & Keefe, 1980). These authors found that "adults who were poor readers did not read for sentence and passage meaning as does the proficient reader. Instead, these adults viewed reading as a task which involved "sounding out" (phonics model) and word identification (whole word/skills model)." (p. 135). The authors go on to state that "A noteworthy finding was that adults who had

'a reading for meaning' orientation improved on standardized reading test scores an average of 1 1/2 to 2 years in a period of three months of reading instruction." (p. 135).

Integrating the learner's previous experiences in a "meaning" approach can possibly affect other language arts areas in addition to reading. For instance, Gold and Johnson (1982) report that adult beginning readers provided with individual psychoeducational tutoring (DL-LEA) demonstrated significant gains in reading, self-esteem, auding and verbal language. This method of psychoeducational tutoring combines directed listening (DL) activities with the language experience approach (LEA), (thus the name DL-LEA) to foster reading improvement.

Learners' dialectic preference and instructional methods may be related to subsequent reading achievement. Weber (1986) conducted an examination of dialect differences in learners and its impact on learning. She notes that dialect differences are a significant factor in learning to read for English speaking adults although she maintains that instructors do not take advantage of these dialect differences. On the contrary, "programs with 'bottom-up' approaches to reading which reify materials as instruction and which dwell on phonics and short passages may exaggerate the significance of dialect differences." (p. 145).

Some question the appropriateness of a phonics-based method for adults and suggest a Language Experience Approach. Gillis and Longnion (1982), for instance, note that "such approaches which consider knowledge of sound-symbol relationships a prerequisite to reading and thus delay the reading of sentences, paragraphs, and larger units until phonics skills are mastered, may not be the most effective for use with adults (p. 86). The authors also suggest that "part of the reason [for adult high attrition in literacy programs] might be the phonics methods used in many ABE classes to reading." They recommend that one method teachers of adults can use to create 'instant readers' is the language experience approach." (p. 88).

Similarly, Boraks & Richardson (1985) and Hall (1981) state that teachers should not emphasize an abstract/symbol approach to reading but rather should stress related words and meaning by teaching reading using functional materials or language-experience programs.

Crandall et al. (1984) found that of those programs using a language-based instructional strategy, language experience approach and classroom oral reading were the common approaches (p. 187). Norman and Malicky (1984) suggest that a "process-functional approach" to teaching adults to read is an alternative to currently used "skill programs." (p. 99). The authors note that "... a major shift in adult basic education has been to more functional types of literacy programs." (p. 93). The authors continue, "The most common techniques suggested by those who advocate a functional program is the language experience approach." (p. 93).

Also suggesting the inclusion of learners' experiences in instructional approaches, Darkenwald (1986), reported that the most effective programs in his study integrated a basic skills focus with instruction in life or survival

skills needed by students to function effectively in the everyday world. In fact, studies show that if learners are not taught relevant literacy skills they can use in their daily lives, they will revert back to former lower literacy levels (Sticht, 1982; Scribner & Cole, 1978).

Furthermore, for some learners, the lack of meaningful materials may not only prevent transfer of reading skills, but may be the cause of high attrition as well. For adults functioning below the fourth grade level, Mikulecky (1986) suggests that "... many programs and tutors allocate more time and resources to general literacy training emphasizing decoding, word attack and literal level understanding of non-functional stories. Research indicates that such approaches are associated with higher attrition, much lower transfer of reading gain, and much higher loss of gain after as little as six weeks." (p. 28).

Since adults, in many cases, have a wide variety of experiences, the emphasis on writing with beginning readers can be beneficial to literacy gains. Lately, much more attention has been given to the importance of writing as it relates to learners' background experiences. Thistlethwaite (1983) sugges s that some students may increase their reading abilities through their attempts to write.

Developing writing skills can improve learners' comprehension in reading. One possible reason for this, as Young and Irwin (1988) note, is that "Incorporating writing within an adult literacy program builds upon these relationships and, at the same time, makes use of the wealth of background knowledge that the learners bring with them." The study by Crandall et al. (1984) of effective programs suggests writing's place in adult literacy programs as well. For instance, the authors noted that "another option to workbooks is student writing...many teachers build lessons from language experience stories or from materials students bring in."

An added instructional dimension to dealing with adults' life experiences is the use of role playing in the classroom. Role playing real life situations as a teaching strategy for adults to generate discussions and subsequent stories has been shown to be successful (Crutchfield, 1981).

Although writing is an important literacy activity, some feel that the learners' perceptions of their spelling inadequacies may prevent them from wanting to write. In one case study (Forester, 1988), the teacher allowed the learner to improvise on the spellings rather than wait to get the correct spelling before proceeding to write. As a result of using approximations of spellings of words, the learner wrote (practiced) more, and subsequently both writing and reading improved. In this case, the learner moved from writing words, to phrases, to sentences and finally to extended text. The author goes on to recommend that instructors should teach reading as "meaning-making" and recommends the following ten instructional strategies (pp. 609-611):

1) help students realize how familiar they are with print
2) use discussion to link sight words with student interests
3) encourage students to work as partners or in small groups based on shared interests, not based on ability level

4) model fluent reading for your students whenever it seems appropriate
5) in one-to-one sessions with the student, encourage them to read along with you as you read aloud
6) get books on tape from the library and produce personalized tapes for students
7) use cloze materials to reinforce the use of syntactic, semantic and experiential aids to making meaning
8) to foster reading practice, discuss their reasons for wanting to learn to read with your students, either singly or in groups
9) invite students to bring in their own reading materials
10) trust students to find their level

Developing adults' critical thinking skills is also an important instructional component. Teaching strategies for developing adults' critical thinking has been recommended (Jarvis, 1985; Goudreau, 1986), and linked to small group "learning circles" (Noddings, 1984; Kazemek, 1988). As Kazemek states, " A learning circle relies on such activities as discussion, writing and sharing journals, writing and reading language-experienced texts, reading with the assistance of a partner, modeling by instructor and peers, and group rereading of various texts (including commonly selected commercially published textbooks) as well as on practice reading strategies guided by an instructor..."(p. 481).

Teacher characteristics have also been analyzed relative to effective programs (Phillips et al. 1985). The authors noted that interviewees mentioned the following traits in respect to teachers' effectiveness:

* class culture/gender sensitivity
* willingness to praise, offer positive encouragement and emphasize students' strengths
* ability to demonstrate high expectations
* counseling skills, including personal, academic and vocational counseling
* communication skills, ability to convey caring
* patience, flexibility, sense of humor, respect for students, friendliness, dedication, helpfulness
* creativity and skill at establishing a relaxed, safe, trusting classroom environment

They go on to mention that programs which emphasized an "empowerment philosophy" ranked highest on all these measures while programs that emphasized skills development ranked lowest.

Emphasizing the blending of teaching and counseling the U.S. Department of Education study suggests that teachers work with students to 1) strengthen their self-concepts 2) build morale and motivation 3) clarify short and long-term goals 4) attack and solve real-world problems and, 5) identify career possibilities. The authors warn however, that literacy providers should not "... try to handle serious emotional or life crisis situations." (p. 26).

Stressing the importance of teachers' impact on learners and the message

teachers send to learners relative to their reading strategies has been noted (Boraks & Schumacher, 1981). They state the following,

> The way a teacher conducts a lesson provides a model for learning. When a teacher introduced words in isolation or focussed on decoding words, students tended to try to recall these words by dealing with their graphic features, not by decoding. When teachers preceded reading with a discussion of concepts in text, students tended to read for meaning and use context in identifying words. Students' beliefs about reading, perhaps guided by prior schooling, also influenced reading strategies: regardless of the skills or strategies being taught, students tried to learn words by their own system (usually by spelling words).
>
> It appears that what teachers teach is less important than how they teach; and how teachers teach is more effective if the taught strategy is believed in by the ABRs and modeled by teachers and peers. (p. 49).

Perhaps Longfield (1984) sums up the teachers' role best by stating, "... functionally illiterate adults need the warmth and understanding of an enlightened teacher who will set the learner at ease, emphasize the positive, be patient and understanding, and set educational objectives around the students' needs and potential." (p. 9).

In this section, a detailed account of the various approaches to teaching adults was presented. Generally, whole-language and phonics-based methods were reviewed. Most authors cited, favored a "reading for meaning" approach to teaching adults that takes advantage of learners' past experiences. Yet, the review also noted programs that combined both phonics and whole-language methods successfully to improve learners reading skills. The question becomes, How much emphasis is placed on one approach over the other? Perhaps beginning readers can benefit from higher dosages of phonics, whereas more advanced readers can explore the meaning of text. Further, How does phonics and whole-language instruction relate to the development of reading strategies that learners' can use to improve and expand their reading potential? Finally, this section identified the need to address learners' "affective" characteristics as a means of improving their motivation for literacy improvement.

The next section will discuss instructional methods appropriate for learners from language minority populations.

<u>How is Instruction Targeted to Meet the Unique Needs of the Language Minority Populations?</u>

As the number of non-English speaking adult learners grows, literacy programs are faced with the challenge of delivering instructional services to this group of learners in order to improve their literacy skills. Although much has been written on ESL methodology, Chall, Heron, and Hilferty, (1987)

suggest that "More information is needed on effective methods of reading instruction for teachers who work with those who are not native speakers of English." (p. 194).

The literature suggests that instructional methods should take into consideration learners' language skills. As Phillips (1984) notes, "Current research in first language reading is applicable to second language reading insofar as the process is concerned. Thus, reading as a "psycholinguistic guessing game" (Goodman, Goodman, & Flores, 1979) and as an interactive process between what the reader sees on the page and what is already in the reader's head (Smith, 1982) is as true for the second language reader as for the first language reader." This section will identify certain teaching methods the literature suggests should be used with ESL adults and also explore the issue of choosing appropriate materials with ESL learners.

However, before moving on to ESL instructional methods, there are at least two facets of the ESL learning experience that research suggests should be considered: 1) ESL Learners' Background and 2) ESL learners' reading strategies. The discussion of these two aspects of ESL instruction was added by ETS staff for purposes of providing a broader knowledge-base on this topic.

Importance of ESL learners' background. Choosing the proper instructional techniques for ESL learners involves the understanding that the background knowledge the learner brings to the instructional settings is important to both materials and approaches used. For instance, O'Malley, Chamot, Stewner-Manzanares, and Kupper, (1987) suggest that even though similarities exist between first and second language reading, unfamiliarity with how the second language works may compromise the learners in their attempt to make accurate guesses about meaning. Further, learners' prior knowledge may not relate to the cultural and linguistic assumptions present in the written text.

Carrell (1984) has noted that schema theory (interaction between the reader's background knowledge and the reading text) is a vital factor for ESL comprehension. According to the author, efficient comprehension ... requires the ability to relate the material to one's own background. This point is well taken since it has been reported that adults from different cultural backgrounds interpret the same texts differently (Joag-dev & Steffensen, 1980). The differences in their interpretations are believed to be based on differences in their backgrounds, which have resulted in their gaining different knowledge structures or schema (Gillis, 1983).

In one study (Johnson, 1981), the culture of origin of the student had more effect on comprehension than the level of syntactic or semantic complexity. Similarly, Nelson (1987) found that "Student recall is significantly higher when reading about their own culture, regardless of expressed preference, and students usually prefer articles and stories from their own culture." (p. 425). The author notes that "there is a need for reading materials related to the culture of the students learning the language." (p. 428). This theme was also highlighted by Obah (1983) who noted that Third World students have educational reading difficulties since "their background experiences reflect a world very different from that portrayed ...

in the material that they read." (p. 130).

This background knowledge acts as a reference point for learners to understand text. If learners are familiar with the content, chances are they will understand it better. This concept is not unique to ESL learners, but has been argued as important for native English speaking adults as well (Hirsch, 1983).

ESL learner reading strategies. As O'Malley et al. (1987) state, "The identification and application of learning strategies by learners of second language has gained much importance and attention in the conduct of research on second language learning." (p. 1). Like their native English counterparts, ESL learners employ certain strategies, and programs should identify and examine these strategies and possibly incorporate them into their instructional approaches. Supporting this notion, Devine (1983) notes that ESL learners "Do appear to have models of reading which they bring with them to the reading classroom." (p. 13). For instance, the author found that ESL learners not only have models of reading, but "they can clearly distinguish their theoretical orientations as sound centered, word centered, or meaning centered." (p. 13).

There is some evidence that different strategies are used by different ethnic groups. For instance, O'Malley et al. (1987) report in one of their earlier studies (O'Malley, Chamot, Manzanares, Kupper & Russo, 1985) that, "Asian students persisted successfully in using rote repetitive strategies, whereas Hispanic students adopted strategies presented during training and showed commensurate gains compared to controls." (p. 2). Appleson et al. (1984) noted that "LEP students were greater risk takers and less embarrassed when making errors. The American born functional illiterate was more concerned with the identification of words, while the second language student was willing to generate hypothesis about the words and about the meaning of the selections." (p. 14).

The importance of reading strategies is common among languages and once they are learned, they can be transferred to the second language. Unfortunately, learners who develop ineffective learning strategies in their first language can create barriers to second language acquisition. O'Malley et al. (1987) note,

> Students who view the reading process as a linear word by word decoding activity in their first language ... are not likely to use strategies in second language reading such as processing meaningful chunks rather than individual words, skipping over redundant items, predicting what is to follow, looking back to correct inaccurate predictions, using context to infer meaning of unfamiliar items, and using linguistic markers to identify features of discourse and text organization. (p. 10).

However, if these reading strategies have already been acquired in the first language, it is very possible that they will be very useful in learning

the second language and transferred to the second language (Cummins, 1982). Echoing this theme, Appleson, Hammerman, and Isaacson (1984) note that apparently those students who could read in any language had some advantage initially over the limited or non-reader (p. 29). Thus, teachers may need to make a conscientious attempt to identify appropriate reading strategies in learners' native language that could be utilized to foster second language acquisition.

The importance of the teacher's style and perceptions of reading (cited earlier by Boraks & Schumacher as important to ABRs in English) is important for ESL instruction as well. Some suggest that it is important that the "right" message come across to the ESL learners. Phillips (1984) reports that second language teachers reinforce students' ideas of reading as a word-by-word process when they call for extensive oral reading that focusses on correct pronunciation rather than on comprehension of meaning. The oral language focus was also noted in a study by Crandall et al. (1984) who found, for effective programs serving ESL adults that -- though some programs grouped by written language ability -- most programs surveyed grouped by oral language abilities (p. 226).

It has been noted that effective learners employ a wide repertoire of metacognitive, cognitive, and social/affective processing strategies. Research suggests that ESL learners can be taught successful reading strategies. For instance, O'Malley et al. (1987) note from their previous research that "When ESL students were trained in the use of selected learning strategies with vocabulary, listening and speaking tasks ... the results indicated that oral proficiency in English and improvements in listening skills were noted." (O'Malley et al. 1985).

O'Malley et al. (1987) divide strategies into two parts; communication strategies and learning strategies. "Communication strategies focus principally on relating or understanding a message as contrasted with learning new information through the second language." (p. 17). Communication strategies include, paraphrasing, repeating, emphasizing, and gesturing. These strategies can be employed in either language.

Learning strategies identified by O'Malley et al. (1987) are divided into three categories; 1) metacognitive 2) cognitive and 3) social affective. Within each category are listed components presented in Figure I:

Figure I

ESL Communication and Learning Strategies (*)

* Metacognitive

- advanced organization
- organizational planning
- directed attention
- selective attention
- self-monitoring
- self-evaluation
- self-management

* Social Affective

- questioning for clarification
- cooperation
- self-talk

* Cognitive

- repetition/imitation
- rehearsal
- resourcing
- translation
- grouping
- notetaking
- summarizing
- deduction/induction
- imagery
- auditory representation
- contextualization
- elaboration
- transfer
- inferencing

(*) O'Malley et al. (1987).

Thus, ESL learner strategies are similar to native English learner strategies in some respects, yet different in others. The differences reflect the varying degrees to which learners are literate in their native language, and the amount and nature of skills they can "borrow" from their native language to support second language acquisition. Further, as O'Malley notes, questions about the "validity of classifying strategies in terms of those which assist comprehension vs. those which assist retention, or those which are applicable to simple vs. complex tasks" (p. 21) needs to be determined.

As with native English speakers, ESL students' backgrounds and reading strategies are important to literacy development. This is especially true of ESL learners who are literate in their native language and have already developed reading strategies that might be transferred to the second language. The next section will address teaching methods for ESL students.

ESL instructional methods. ESL learners are not a homogeneous group. In fact, non-English speaking adults bring various degrees of literacy in their native language and various degrees of oral fluency in English to the instructional setting (Harman, 1984). Supporting this view, Longfield (1984) notes, "An adult ESL class is probably more heterogeneous than a native American ABE class." (p. 18). Providing an example of the range of experiences and knowledge, Crandall et al. (1984) noted one program in their study that assigned those who came to the U.S. with a B.A. degree but no conversational ability in English were put in the "fast track" class while those who had no previous schooling were grouped differently (p. 226). This variety of learners' prior knowledge has consequences for choosing instructional methodologies and materials.

Some researchers have begun to identify the various levels of adult native and second language literacy levels. For instance, Savage (1984) makes the distinction between ESL students who are literate in their native language and those who need literacy training in English. Macias (1988) provides more information on this topic from his analyses of a national data base and found that "...of those who were classified as English illiterate, 35% were literate in Spanish (only) ... this means that more than 1 out of 3 persons might be able to use their Spanish literacy to acquire English literacy since they were already literate." (p. 15).

Identifying the various levels of literacy and providing appropriate instruction can involve more work. For example, Longfield (1984) states, "ESL teachers are often expected to teach two subjects at once: ESL and literacy skills to students who may have poor cognitive development. The question becomes, When do we teach English as a Second Language? and, When do we teach English literacy skills? The answer to this question depends on the program's philosophy of literacy, and their resources both fiscal and human. Some programs serve only those adult learners who have sufficient English speaking skills (like certain library-based programs) while others teach native language literacy and gradually introduce English listening and speaking skills.

Research suggests that building on learners' prior experiences and fluency in their native language will facilitate acquisition of the second language (Cummins, 1982; Krashen, 1982). According to this theory, Common Underlying Proficiencies are present in both languages; so developing proficiencies in native language literacy can help the acquisition of the second language (Cummins, 1982; Krashen, 1982; Thonis, 1982; Swain, 1979). Thus, trying to teach a second language to an adult who needs basic literacy skills can be accommodated by focusing in on their native cognitive skills. As a study in California noted, "Students who lack literacy in any language clearly have more difficulty in learning to read and write English than do students who are literate in their native tongue." (SRA, 1987, p. 35).

Understanding the learners' native language capabilities can provide insight into their potential capabilities in the second language. For instance, Angus (1986) found a correlation (though mild) between Hispanic Navy recruits' Spanish pre-test scores and greater gains in English. Apparently, ESL recruits' native language literacy skills were predictive of their subsequent gains in English literacy.

As noted in the previous section, research suggests that an emphasis placed on teaching ESL learners appropriate reading strategies will produce good results. As Devine (1983) concluded after examining adult ESL internalized models of the reading process, "... a further relationship can be found between the internalized model of reading and the success of the reader in comprehending text material." (p. 13). The author suggests that a meaning-centered approach to reading seems to predict more successful comprehension than a word-centered or (especially) a sound-centered approach. Instructors might give thought as to how they can assist students in adopting reading strategies that could be called meaning-centered. The author notes that "the language experience approach seems particularly fruitful in encouraging L2

reading students to focus primary attention on meaning in written text." (p. 13).

A review of teaching strategies for ESL adults was conducted by Savage (1984). She proposes three teaching strategies that fall into three categories:

1. synthetic (focus on patterns)
2. analytic (focus on meaning)
3. pre-reading.

For learners at the "pre-reading" stage, Savage suggests introducing the concept that things can be symbolized through writing. "Activities begin by working with real objects, then linking real objects to pictures." (p. 6).

Another objective of pre-reading activities is to develop visual discrimination skills. Savage (1984) lists a number of commercial texts that contain these pre-reading activities. Another perspective on pre-reading skills is suggested by Nelson (1987) for passages that "fit the reader's schema and when it does not." (p. 428). These pre-reading activities are crucial in that they develop the learner's background experiences -- experiences to which they can refer to when reading subsequent text.

Pearson-Casanave (1984) divides pre-reading activities into two categories 1) those derived directly from the reading text, such as discussing the title, illustrations, headings, and charts, plus scanning and skimming and, 2) those that are external to the text. External preparation can be noncommunicative, such as using slides, videos, films, pictures, lectures, and field trips, or communicative, such as using student pairs, small groups, class discussions, and outside contacts." (quoted in Nelson 1987, p. 428). These pre-reading activities are important because they build background knowledge, thus learners are able to predict as they read (Goodman, 1967), becoming better readers and comprehending more (Nelson, 1987).

With regard to Savage's analytic stage, she suggests that for the ESL learner who has learned the concept that "things can be symbolized through writing ... activities which focus on meaning are effective." She notes, " ... the context arises from interest, personal experiences or need...In ESL literacy instruction, strategies which focus on meaning are used at the word level, at the phrase and sentence level, and beyond the sentence level." (p. 8).

Many authors have focused in on what Savage refers to the "meaning" component of ESL instruction. Yet the need for reading materials related to the culture of the students learning the language is still lacking (Nelson, 1987). To compensate for this lack of resources, Nelson suggests the use of the language experience approach, using thematic units about topics familiar to learners, then branching out to other non-familiar topics.

Finally, at the synthetic level, Savage suggests the use of patterns presented through phonics, through carefully controlled and sequenced presentation of syllables or structures, and through the grouping of letters

and numbers to teach writing (p. 19). Using teaching techniques (such as identifying the first letter/sound of a word), which are used for native language instruction, still need to incorporate words/vocabulary relevant to the adult.

The importance of the relationship between word context and prior experiences dealing with the words has been underscored in other research. Perkins and Brutten (1983) report that the importance of context and word recognition seem to be the same for L1 and L2 readers. They note that "It seems that the context of words, their frequency and the quality of their context is important to the L2 student's understanding of the word and sentence. The implications are that the 'vocabulary' and grammar encountered [by ESL learners] should have already been learnt save for the gradual introduction of a few novel vocabulary items." (p. 127). The notion that ESL instruction should proceed with what learners already know plus a little more is also suggested by Krashen (1982). He notes in his i+1 theory that learners' previous knowledge (i) needs to be the basis for instruction and then additional pieces of information (1) need to be added to this base of prior knowledge in a "comprehensible input format."

The frequency of the word and the "richness" of its context is very important to comprehension. Perkins and Brutten (1983) note that if CLOZE passages (recommended by others as effective teaching techniques: Longfield, 1984; Savage, 1984) are to be used for practice, prediction, and word guessing, such experiences should be sequenced from high frequency-rich context in the beginning passages to low frequency-poor context (if ever) in the more advanced materials." (p. 127). According to the authors, the question as to whether a word is high frequency depends on the learners' background.

Listening has been noted in previous research as an important activity (Conrad, 1985; Mayer, 1985), and is considered central to second language acquisition (Asher, 1982; Gary & Gary, 1981), especially at the beginning stages of ESL. Effective teaching methodologies that focus on listening at the beginning level of second language study include the Total Physical Response (TPR). TPR (Asher, 1982) is based on the premise that listening comprehension should precede speaking the second language. In fact, listening comprehension skills can be of a higher order (not just recall of facts) than those that can be actually expressed by the learner. Yet merely waiting for the learner to "produce" output before moving on to higher order activities may actually delay their cognitive development in the second language. Teachers must facilitate the listening stage with content related activities based on modifications of the spoken word.

Research suggests that teachers can facilitate the listening process in several ways. For example, Hatch (1979) suggests that second language comprehension can be fostered by, 1) slower rate and clear articulation, which helps learners to identify word boundaries more easily, and allows more processing time, 2) more use of high frequency vocabulary, less slang, fewer idioms, and 3) syntactic simplification, shorter sentences. Providing such "comprehensible input" in "low anxiety situations" (Krashen, 1982) improves the learners chances for acquiring the second language. Savage adds practices

such as "longer pauses at natural breaks, ... and exaggerated intonation accompanied by appropriate body language and movement" as important modifications of speech in ESL lessons.

Organizing speaking instruction based on ESL students' learning characteristics can be very productive. For instance, Krashen suggests that ESL students either "learn" or "acquire" the second language. Students who "learn" the language pay special attention to the structure of the language and the accuracy of pronunciation and grammar. Students who "acquire" language, do so naturally, through listening comprehension methods and prompts given by the teacher in "low-anxiety" situations. Given this situation, teaching approaches that take advantage of these learning styles can get the most out of learners' strengths to produce greater results. Alamprese et al. (1988) identify seven speaking techniques that are related either to language "learners" or language "acquirers." For language acquirers, the authors note teaching techniques such as: 1) early production, 2) role playing, and 3) language generating. For language learners the teaching techniques include: 1) drills, and 2) dialogue. Techniques useful for both types of learners are pair-practice and information gap techniques. (pp. 13-15).

Other successful strategies identified in ESL instruction include role playing and the use of realia in the classroom (Crandall et al. 1984; Asher, 1982). The Crandall study found that topics that "got the students going" were often those related to the students' previous experiences (p. 226)." Similar observations regarding role playing and language experience approach were found for native adult English speakers as well (Crutchfield, 1981).

Appleson et al. (1984), reported on an adult literacy program that provided instruction for both native English speakers and non-English speakers. They found that having native English speakers to model for ESL students could be beneficial, suggesting that "Contact with native speakers did facilitate the learning process for the Limited English Proficient (LEP) student. Second language learners needed to vocalize what they read by re-telling, discussing vocabulary, analyzing humor and evaluating syntax." (p. 17). The program used the following three stages of reading as part of its instructional program:

1. Introduction (introducing the idea of reading as understanding the written form of someone's speech)

2. Immersion (exposing the learner to all types of print)

3. Independence (learner chooses which materials and stories to read).

From these stages, the following effective teaching strategies were identified. For the Introduction stage the program used the language experience approach; for the Immersion stage they used group activities, pairing/peer teaching, assisted reading (where some pairing was done with a foreign born and native speaker) for the Independent stage they used a variety of materials such as those which were commercially developed, newspapers, individualized reading materials, etc. The program also reported using games,

sustained silent reading, and the use of taped stories with the learners.

Pairing of foreign born students with native speakers or former program students was found successful in another study. Phillips et al. (1985) analyzed 400 effective adult literacy programs and found that peer support was a strong feature of the ESL programs. The authors noted, "The ESL sites and other programs reported that people were more willing to participate and remain in the program when they were matched with tutors of the same ethnic and/or class background." (p. 16).

Other research supports this finding and suggests that minorities show high attrition rates partly because their middle-class and upper-class white tutors fail to understand or empathize with the different cultures, values, and pressures experienced by minority students (Darkenwald, 1975).

Savage describes successful ESL strategies as developing sight word vocabulary, making word associations, matching pictures and words and arranging words to form sentences to name a few activities (p. 14). She does note however, that in addition to the above approaches "instruction must also include activities which focus on meaning beyond the sentence level (p. 14). Thus she recommends TPR, sequencing of pictures or sentences to form paragraphs, language experience approach, and the use of Cloze exercises since the object of Cloze is to develop the students ability to predict, to get meaning from context, and to focus on the whole passage rather than on isolated segments.

As mentioned above, research has shown that developing literacy skills in the learners' native language will facilitate transference of literacy skills to the second language (Cummins, 1982). For many adult literacy programs, providing basic literacy skills in the native language will go a long way towards helping the learner acquire the second language. The basic concept is to build on learners' strengths, not weaknesses. However, politics may play a role in whether programs approach literacy in this fashion. For instance, while realizing the advantages of developing native language literacy to promote second language literacy, Longfield notes, "It would be politically unsavory to fund bilingual education for adults when bilingual education for children is already so severely criticized." (p. 12). As with other differences noted between children and adults relative to learning presented in earlier sections of this report, perhaps this issue may also have to be treated differently. With the number of Limited English Proficient adults enrolling in adult education classes increasing, and the need for them to learn English increasing (e.g., Amnesty), identifying their native language literacy strengths to facilitate English acquisition may be more beneficial to adults and save time as well.

Suggestions for teaching ESL learners were presented in this section. The fact that ESL learners are not a homogeneous group -- culturally or linguistically -- was noted. Learners come from different backgrounds and with varying degrees of literacy development in their native language. The challenge is to identify the learners' strengths and build an instructional strategy around those strengths. Although -- as the literature suggests -- materials may not be adequate for this population, the use of the language

experience approach with this population (especially for beginning readers) was recommended as an alternative.

The next section will explore the uses of technology in adult education and its impact on learners.

Technology and Adult Literacy Instruction

Uses of Technology. There is considerable interest at the present time in the use of technology in literacy instruction. Many literacy programs are experimenting with computers, videodiscs and other technological applications. In fact, a national network of researchers and practitioners (sponsored by the Adult Literacy and Technology Project) has been established to promote greater technology use in literacy instruction (Meenan, 1988). New instructional software and systems aimed at improving literacy among adults are being developed by many publishers (Apple, 1988), and the number of literacy programs that are experimenting with or actively using technology in instruction is growing rapidly (Crandall et al. 1984). Furthermore, computers are also finding a role in program administration (Solorzano, 1988).

People use the general label "technology" to describe many different types of mechanical and electronic systems. While these systems share many characteristics, they differ in important ways, and it is useful to examine them separately. For the purposes of this review we will distinguish between minicomputer networks, microcomputers, interactive videodiscs, instructional television and videotapes, and satellite broadcast systems. First, we will describe the way each type of technology is being applied in adult literacy, and then we will examine the impact of the systems based on published research and evaluations.

Minicomputer networks. The first type of computerized instructional systems to be developed used mainframe or minicomputers to control a network of terminals. (The number of terminals differed depending on the specific hardware and software, but most systems could handle 20-30 terminals with ease.) An integrated software program on the minicomputers controlled the instructional dialogue at each of the terminals, and it could operate with many users at the same time. A room or portion of a room was usually set aside as a computer laboratory, and the terminals were installed in this location. Such systems have been in use since the 1970s, and they have been improved as the technology has been modernized. Contemporary instructional computer networks are sometimes referred to as integrated learning systems, and they have a wide range of configurations and capabilities.

The software that runs on such minicomputer networks contains both instructional modules and a management system to keep track of learners and their progress through the lessons. The instructional software usually covers a broad curriculum area and is subdivided into objectives, modules or competencies that are presented in sequence. One of the first systems of this type is called PLATO and it was developed by Control Data Corporation. Courseware has been written to run on the PLATO system in many subject fields including adult basic skills. The Basic Skills Learning System is a program

delivered using the PLATO computer-based education system that has been used to promote adult literacy. Similar minicomputer networks are available from Computer Curriculum Corporation (CCC), WICAT Corporation, Prescription Learning Corporation and other vendors (Turner, 1988b).

Most of these systems now have software that would be appropriate for adult literacy programs (Bialo & Sivin, 1989). However, very few literacy programs are using minicomputer networks. The chief reason is cost. The initial start-up costs associated with PLATO or CCC are approximately $50,000. As Turner (1988) noted "because of the cost of purchasing [minicomputer] systems, few literacy programs have access to one of them..."

Microcomputers. For the purposes of this review, the most important distinction between minicomputer networks and microcomputers is that the electronic minicomputer network uses shared software while microcomputers "stand alone." Each microcomputer must be loaded with a separate piece of software. Microcomputers also have a smaller storage capacity than minicomputers. As a result, microcomputer software covers a smaller content area and does not contain an extensive management component to track and retain records on learner progress. Consequently, microcomputer software is much less expensive than the comprehensive software packages sold with instructional minicomputer systems. In addition, microcomputers, themselves, are much less expensive than minicomputers. A single microcomputer can be purchased for $2,000 - $3,000, compared to $50,000 for a minicomputer network. However, the distinctions between minicomputers and microcomputers are becoming blurred as microcomputers become more powerful and software becomes available to permit microcomputers to operate in a network. For the moment, the differences between microcomputers and minicomputer networks are great enough to warrant separate discussions.

Microcomputer software relevant for adult literacy includes tutorials, simulations and drill and practice lessons on specific literacy topics. (See Apple, 1988 for a sample of appropriate software.) For example, the Technology for Literacy Center maintains an extensive collection of software, and they select the lesson or application that is appropriate for each individual learner (Stockdill, 1988). Similarly, the Computer Assisted Literacy in Libraries (CALL) program developed a resource guide to correlate software they developed as well as existing software with their curriculum (Moulton, 1988). In addition, microcomputers are frequently used with general purpose productivity software, such as word processors or spreadsheets, that can be integrated into adult literacy programs (Young & Irwin, 1988). Finally, new types of software, such as HyperCard, possess the potential for creating new instructional applications in the area of adult literacy (Fleishman & Bixler, 1988).

Because they do not have to be wired into a network, microcomputers can be placed in many different configurations. Some literacy programs place one or two computers in separate work areas so they can be used independently. On the other hand, many programs prefer to cluster their microcomputers together in laboratory-like settings.

Instructional television and videotape. Since the inception of television, there have been attempts to use the medium as an educational vehicle. One of the most successful educational television programs has been Sesame Street, which has had a positive impact on millions of children. Other instructional television programs for children also have been successful (Ball, Bogatz, Kazarow, & Rubin, 1974).

However, there have been few instructional television programs for wide broadcast that were designed specifically for adults. Early experiences with educational television for adults were not successful (Brown & Newman, 1970), and this may have dampened enthusiasm for this medium in the United States. For instance, the authors report on the television series Operation Alphabet that was designed "...to satisfy the needs of the complete illiterate..." Yet as the authors found, "... it is probable that at the beginning stages adults, possibly even more than children, require the reassurance of a live teacher." (p. 37).

Recently there has been renewed interest in developing instructional television programming for adults. Notable in this field is the Learning To Read Series produced by Kentucky Educational Television (KET). This series of lessons has been broadcast by public TV stations in many cities, and a follow-up series is under development.

Programs that have been developed for broadcast can also be disseminated on videotape, and many schools maintain large libraries of videotaped instructional programming. This resource has great potential value to adult literacy programs. As Lane (1988) noted, "videotapes abound on important subjects to literacy students," and these can be an important element in the instructional process.

Instructional television is unique among the technologies discussed here because it can be viewed by individuals who are not enrolled in any formal educational program. At the same time, the programs can be incorporated into adult literacy efforts in a more organized manner. Videotaped programming can be used in traditional classroom or tutorial settings. Furthermore, instructional television can reach students in rural or isolated areas and students who want to learn in the privacy of their own homes.

Interactive videodiscs. Interactive videodiscs combine the programmability of computers with the high quality visual images of television or videotape. A microcomputer linked to a videodisc player offers many of the advantages of both media. However, because of the complexity of the technology, the initial cost of this equipment is considerably higher than the cost of microcomputers alone. In addition, this is a very new technology, that has only been available commercially for one or two years. Nevertheless, there is widespread interest in the application of this technology to adult education. Its capability to produce high quality images taken from real life situations and integrate them into a flexible instructional sequence give it great potential as an adult educational tool. A current example of the use of this technology is the Principals of Adult Literacy System (PALS). PALS is a literacy instructional system for adults that uses interactive videodisc

technology. PALS uses the IBM InfoWindow videodisc system as an element in a multimedia phonemic approach to literacy instruction.

Satellite broadcast technology. Another approach that had been developed in the past few years is satellite broadcast technology. Many facilities now have the capability to receive high quality broadcast transmission directly from satellites. Some people use the phrase "distance learning" to describe educational programming received at remote locations through satellite broadcast or other means, such as fiber optic cables.

Satellite technology has been used in many countries to provide educational programs to remote areas. For example, DeStefano and Abadiano (1988) report that English as a foreign language programs currently under development by the United States Information Agency will be distributed around the world using the WorldNet satellite communications system. Similar satellite programing has been used in the United States in Alaska as part of the Educational Satellite Communications Demonstration (ESCD/Alaska). Current satellite education networks include the Arts & Sciences Teleconferencing Service (produced by Oklahoma State University) and the Ti-In network (with headquarters in Texas).

One of the most exciting aspects of this technology is that it permits interactive educational programming at great distances and in very remote locations, giving it promise for reaching rural and isolated learners. A fully equipped satellite system can transmit high quality audio, video and data in both directions, allowing interactive communications. At the present time, most applications support only limited interactivity. For example, in the TI-IN network only the audio portion of the broadcast is interactive, using existing telephone communication networks (TI-In Network, 1988). The video signal is transmitted "one-way" from the central location to the receiving stations.

This technology holds promise for bringing literacy instruction to locations that are not being served. However, the initial cost of equipment is high. To date, there has been little experience using satellite broadcast technology in literacy programs, but this is a promising area for further exploration.

Research on the Impact of Technology. While much experimentation is taking place in this area, the research base regarding technology in adult literacy is somewhat limited. Only a few controlled studies have been conducted to assess the effectiveness of different technological solutions to the illiteracy problem. For example, a review of the ERIC database produced fewer than ten experimental studies that addressed this issue directly.

Nevertheless, the research that has been conducted suggests that many types of technology can be used effectively to increase the literacy of adults. In the area of minicomputer networks, Caldwell and Rizza (1979) examined the impact of the Basic Skills Learning System delivered using the PLATO computer-based education system. They reported highly significant gains in reading in a relatively short time. Adult learners using the system gained more than one grade level equivalent in reading on the average in less than 15

hours of instructional time.

Many literacy providers are experimenting with stand-alone microcomputers and separate pieces of software that relate to specific reading or writing skills. It is more difficult to judge the effectiveness of such an eclectic use of technology, because the patterns of use may differ from individual to individual and from provider to provider. Wangberg (1985) reported significant gains for students using the LEAP I and LEAP II software programs to promote reading. Stockdill (1988) reported that computers were used to good effect in the Technology for Literacy Project. This program used microcomputers to provide individualized literacy lessons to adults as a supplement to one-on-one tutoring. The evaluation concluded that technology was an effective tool for use in adult literacy programs.

Early research on interactive video seems promising. Karlstein (1988) examined the use of the interactive videodisc system, Principals of Adult Literacy System (PALS), with inner-city high school students. PALS is a literacy instructional system for adults that uses interactive videodisc technology. The program uses phonemic spelling to allow students to write anything they can say. District evaluations of the PALS program were positive, and the project was expanded. Dramatic gains in literacy were noted for some students, but final results from all participants were not reported. The computer interactions are supplemented by contact with a regular teacher to provide positive human feedback. Yet Bosco (1988) points out "interactive video offers unparalleled opportunities and challenges. It offers no magic but deserves serious consideration by those who seek to make literacy universal in the United States."

Current research suggests that technology can be an effective tool for promoting literacy among adults. What is less clear is how the technology is best used. Successful demonstration sites have incorporated computers and other technology in different ways, and there has not been enough research to determine which patterns of use are most effective.

The research does seem to agree on some of the reasons that technology can be effective with adult learners. Caldwell and Rizza (1979) concluded that the Basic Skills Learning System was effective because it was individualized, provided more opportunities for interaction and feedback, used a multi-sensory approach, and was modularized for easy adaptation to a wide variety of learning needs. Bialo & Sivin (1989) noted that integrated minicomputer systems "seem to be particularly effective with students who respond to a consistent and individualized approach." PALS, too, is highly individualized and provides extensive feedback to learners. Turner (1988) reported that microcomputers were effective in the Technology for Literacy Project because they "provide privacy, immediate feedback, individualization, control and flexibility." These seem to be the key elements that technology can bring to adult literacy instruction.

Despite the successes of the programs and pilot project reported above, the sentiments expressed by Olson (1985) are probably still valid today: "experimental studies and pilot programs have confirmed the advantages of computer-assisted instruction for adult literacy; however, the use of

computers in literacy programs has been sporadic."

Yet despite the sporadic use of computers or other forms of technology in literacy programs, some research suggests that adults may be willing to use them as an alternative instructional method. For instance, Lane et al. (1984) asked adult learners which extra ways of learning would they be willing to try. Seventy-one percent mentioned a willingness to try computers; 66% mentioned T.V. instruction; 63% stated video tapes and 52% mentioned the use of films. The four highest responses were technology related.

The potential role for technology in literacy education is great, and there are compelling reasons to look to technology as a solution to literacy problems. As Chisman (1989) noted, "Given the scope of the basic skills problem, technology -- particularly computer-aided learning systems -- must be part of the solution, simply because it promises greater economies of scale and the benefits of self-paced instruction."

Materials

What Materials Do Programs Use for the Native English Speaker?

Research suggests that programs "Build a curriculum that reflects the students' goals, interests, and needs, and incorporates the program mission." Yet building the curriculum in this fashion is only part of the process. A recent unpublished report by the U.S. Department of Education (1988) suggests that programs need to continually monitor the appropriateness of their curriculum. The report's authors note, "Program staff and students in an effective literacy program work together to design, revise, and modify the curriculum so that it stays interesting and responsive to the students' goals and the program context."

Much of the decision related to instructional materials reflects the program's philosophy of adult literacy. For instance, Phillips et al. (1985) report that "Program philosophies heavily influence the use of teaching materials, just as the same philosophies had determined attitudes toward testing and diagnosis." The authors uncovered various types of programs and found that the skills-oriented programs tended to use commercially-developed, prescriptive curricula keyed toward helping students attain particular competencies ... whereas ... the programs emphasizing empowerment varied their use of materials and methods according to the student population being served.

In a study of California's literacy providers SRA (1987) reported that educational institutions (adult schools and community colleges) used a wide variety of instructional materials whereas community-based organizations and library-based literacy programs use Laubach Way to Reading materials published by New Readers Press. Other research conducted with library-based adult literacy programs has uncovered this trend as well (Wurzbacher & Yeannakis, 1986; Lane, McGuire, Yeannakis & Wurzbacher, 1984; Solorzano & Stecher, 1987). Interestingly, however, these programs also use a variety of learning materials to supplement the Laubach skill books.

Much of the problem in teaching adults to read is finding appropriate and interesting materials. There is great concern that reading materials used to teach adults are neither interesting nor appropriate. As Brown and Newman (1970) point out, "One of the most significant findings in much of the research reveals the importance of using meaningful subject matter in teaching the beginning adult reader." (p. 20). Early adult literacy programs used materials created for children because it was assumed that there was little difference between adult learning and learning by children (Cass, 1971; Cook, 1977). Kazemek (1988) notes that "Commercial materials that are widely used with adults -- for example, many of the workbooks published by New Readers Press and Steck-Vaughn -- are often indistinguishable in form and content from those used in elementary school classrooms." (p. 465). Supporting this viewpoint, Chall et al. (1987) note that successful literacy programs stress the importance of practice as it relates to increasing learners' reading levels, yet they point out that learners "... must practice reading interesting and readable materials, which unfortunately, may not be available commercially." (p. 195).

The problem of selecting appropriate materials for adults is especially difficult since one needs to identify high interest and low reading level materials. However, research suggests that if materials are used that are of high interest to adults, positive results may occur. For instance, Hutchinson (1978) found that the experimental group performed better than the control group after receiving instruction with individualized teacher-made selections based on the stated interests of learners. The control group used commercially prepared workbooks and kits.

Therefore, perhaps guidance in the area of material selection and dissemination is appropriate. According to Kazemek (1988), one of our pressing responsibilities is to help program directors, teachers, and tutors begin to reconsider their instructional materials and methods. We must learn to go beyond the controlled texts and tightly sequenced skills approaches which most often make reading and writing harder instead of easier -- texts and approaches with which many adult students have already experienced failure." (p. 482). Although this is a challenge, the literature continually suggests that programs should choose relevant learner-focused materials (Mayer, 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1988). The U.S. Department of Education's Report on adult literacy programs notes that "Teaching materials should look and read like normal adult reading materials, for example, paperback novels, newspapers, and manuals that don't announce their reading levels on the cover. Real-life materials should be used whenever possible." (p. 43).

The use of real-life materials is especially important with rural students. Hone (1984) points out after surveying 54 rural exemplary programs that curriculum is actively shaped by employment possibilities, social or political issues in an area, students' prior experiences, and what they will find useful." (p. 15).

Another problem in choosing adult learner materials is determining the appropriate reading level of the books. Determining the reading level is not only difficult, but can actually be the cause of the lack of student progress

(Rogers, 1987). In examining reading series used by volunteer groups, the author states that "problems with inconsistent levels of difficulty would seem to be pervasive in this market." (p. 27). The inconsistent levels of difficulty with the materials used could -- in the authors opinion -- "easily discourage tutors and students by means of apparent failures." (p. 27). The problem is that different models are used to estimate "readability indices." As a result, "...the information is of limited utility to someone like a tutor who might wish to compare the relative difficulties of two different [reading] series."(p. 27). The author recommends that publishers should "stipulate any presumed entry skills required of students who might be given these textbooks." (p. 27).

This opinion is similar to Crandall et al. (1984), who acknowledge the "... readability level of commercial material to be a problem." (p. 216). Yet, on the other hand, the authors present a paradox. They quote an ABE director in their sample who states, "my assumption and experience has been that they want to read the same things that I do .." In this case, perhaps high interest relevant materials for adults may be too difficult for them to read. Yet the learner motivational factor may outweigh the "logistical" reasons for selecting low-level reading materials.

After selecting appropriate materials, matching the curriculum to adults' needs and the reading process is yet another challenge for literacy programs. Knowles (1978) states that the andragogical model requires a process-oriented curriculum rather than the usual content-oriented plan. According to the author, the process includes the following:

1. establishing a climate that is conducive to learning
2. creating a mechanism that allows for mutual planning of both content and procedures in instruction
3. diagnosing the needs
4. determining content in the form of program or course objectives
5. planning the actual learning experiences, including sequencing them appropriately
6. conducting the learning procedures -- teaching the class
7. evaluating outcomes in relation to the originally stated needs

Knowles recommends that these processes be conducted as a joint venture between teacher and learner.

The literature also strongly recommends that programs contain enough supplemental reading materials for learners so as to reflect their changing interests and goals and also to encourage them to practice reading. Boraks and Richardson (1981) suggest that "Adults in mid-life and beyond may find task-oriented reading materials will not be enough ... adults do often change their interests and goals direction as they become older and as they read more proficiently." (p. 5). As a result, the authors recommend that a choice of materials be made available for the adults. This finding is similar to that of Balmuth (1987). She notes that, "It is necessary to have available an assortment of materials supplementary to the materials of the central system, since students vary in their reading interests as well as in the amount of

practice they require." (p. 19).

Supplemental materials can also expand and broaden the learners' knowledge and desire to read more. When Brown and Newman (1970) surveyed 207 ABE students, they found it "necessary and desirable to develop considerable supplementary material both from an interest standpoint and from the need of extending the materials horizontally for the slower members in the group." (p. 35). Pasch and Oakley (1985) asked their learners to recommend changes for program improvement and the two highest responses were "more interesting materials and more advanced materials." (p. 11).

The careful selection and use of supplementary materials can also positively affect program retention rates. Stauffer (1973) found that "tutors who used supplemental teaching materials with their students had 18.4% fewer dropouts." (p. 72). Hutchinson (1978) also found that learners who used teacher-made material based on their own interests attended more hours of class. Therefore, supplemental materials can be a powerful resource in improving literacy and reducing the dropout rate of adults in literacy programs.

As this section points out, materials reflect the program's philosophy of literacy and their instructional focus. Yet, as this review recommends, materials should also relate to the learners' goals. The review recommends that care be taken in choosing materials to insure that they are visually suitable and that the subject matter is relevant to the learner. Also, most of the authors in this section would recommend that a variety of supplemental materials be made available to the learners so they can explore other texts as their reading improves.

<u>What Materials do Programs Use for Learners Who are Illiterate in Their Primary Language and English?</u>

Finding materials that are adequate for learners that are illiterate in their native and second language is indeed difficult. As Longfield notes, "While there is an ample market of ESL materials for adults, most assume that the adult is literate and will transfer literacy skills to the second language. Few materials are available for teaching literacy skills to the limited English Proficient speaker." (pp. 18-19). Savage notes, "The use of textbooks is one of the major differences between an ESL literacy class and an 'ordinary' ESL class. For literate ESL students, textbooks are an aid to memory. For the nonliterate, traditional texts have been one more obstacle to overcoming the problem of learning English." (p. 31). Thus, programs must be aware of the developmental stages of the learner and apply appropriate teaching methods and materials.

Further, the understanding of this ESL/Literacy distinction has repercussions for teaching ESL learners. For instance, as Savage notes, "...most ESL materials introduce reading and writing exercises as a reinforcement to the listening and speaking skills ... " She says also that this technique is particularly successful with students who are literate in their own language and who transfer word attack skills from their language to English..." (p. 25). However, she notes that reading and writing activities

are also important for the learner needing basic literacy skills as well. Savage states "... to totally shift away from concentration on paper and pencil, book-oriented activities to strictly oral conversations and pattern drills is the fulfillment of only half of our responsibilities." (p. 25).

In essence, for this group of learners, methods that are in many cases not tied to commercial curriculum seem to work best. That is, the curriculum is either locally developed or totally learner centered. For instance, Longfield (1984) recounts that since the prevailing theory had been that one did not teach such persons literacy skills until their listening and speaking skills were proficient, most programs did not pay much attention to reading and writing in the ESL classroom. Thus she states, "The real problem is the lack of materials designed for persons just learning to speak the language who are at the zero level in reading and writing skills." (p. 23). Therefore, "materials" she suggests for this group are tied to teaching strategies such as the following: 1) language experience approach, 2) strip stories, 3) one-word approach, 4) cloze techniques, 5) snap reading, and 6) adaptation of materials (simplifying language but not concepts).

It is important to note that content can be used to teach ESL learners. Although they can not read in English, they have broad life experiences in their native language, and these experiences can be transferred into English lessons using a content-based approach. Proponents of this approach suggest that, "Rather than organizing the lesson around language items like sentence patterns or around language skills like reading and writing, the teacher chooses a theme or topic appropriate to the class and uses this content information for integrated work with language skills and language items." This approach is different from the Language Experience approach since "...there is a systematic plan for integrating language learning with mastering the content." (Mohan, 1988, p. 8).

<u>What Materials do Programs Use for Learners Who are Literate in Their Native Language and Illiterate in English?</u>

Much of the discussion regarding materials for ESL (or Limited English Proficient) learners centers around their relevancy regarding the background experiences of the ESL learner. Unfortunately, most ESL textbooks contain selections that students know little about, especially students from non-Western cultures. For instance, as noted earlier, the ESL learners' background experiences correlate to their subsequent comprehension in the second language (Nelson, 1987). Yet, in many cases, materials used in adult literacy programs do not reflect the background experiences of the ESL learner, in fact "an analysis of ESL textbooks reveals a propensity for passages from British and American literature, American and British newspaper articles, short biographies of famous Americans, and numerous articles on aspects of American culture such as racial issues, old age, retirement, and food (Nelson, 1987).

Materials that prepare ESL adults in basic literacy activities are an important component of the instructional delivery system for this learner population. Yet most programs do not make this distinction. If learners are literate in their native language, they are taught with English materials. If

they are illiterate in their native language, they are taught using oral repetition activities until they can begin to produce speech in English.

For this latter group, the natural approach to English acquisition might be more appropriate than traditional approaches. In this case, less emphasis is placed on "materials" as such -- they do not "drive" the curriculum. More emphasis is placed on listening comprehension. The method (e.g., Total Physical Response, sheltered English) is stressed while teachers can use locally developed materials to elicit responses from the learners. Lessons do not necessarily need to be grammatical or audio-lingual in nature (Terrell, 1982).

Developing the listening and prior content-based knowledge of the learner is essential. Savage suggests three commercially developed sets of materials which provide prior aural/oral exercises for adults with vocabulary in context that prepare them for the subsequent phonics exercises. They are: Longfield (1981) Passage to ESL Literacy: Student Workbook; Haverson and Haynes (1980) Modulearn ESL Literacy Program: Learner Workbook; and Bassano (1980), Consonants Sound Easy and Sounds Easy.

In the previous section, the suggestion was made that materials should be adapted (perhaps by simplifying language) to assist the second language learner, but that the "concepts" embedded in the text be left intact. This is a very important point in second language instruction and material selection. There is a question as to whether ESL learners have cognitive or linguistic deficits which hinder or help second language acquisition. DeAvila (1984) suggests that bilinguals have language, not cognitive, deficits and that the cognitive skills that students have should be further strengthened through instruction that includes activities of higher order cognitive demand. DeAvila suggests that most classroom practice focuses on rote learning of facts and not on complex forms of information processing so that the cognition advantages of bilingual students are seldom seen or exercised.

Developing meaningful materials for ESL learners literate in their native language is essential. These learners know what reading entails, yet, they need assistance in transferring these skills in order to speak and eventually read and write English. As Longfield (1984) explains, "...concentration on language drills and grammar exercises which, by their very nature, are out of context and contain no important message to be conveyed to learners should be avoided. What we want is to teach the language, not to teach about the language." (p. 23).

How Are Materials Selected?

As Phillips et al. (1985), suggest, the program philosophy influences the selection of materials. They note that skills-oriented programs tend to use commercially-developed, prescriptive curricula keyed toward helping students attain particular competencies, whereas programs emphasizing empowerment varied their use of materials according to the student population being served. In the latter case, the authors found that "teachers systematically developed materials utilizing student input and also encouraged

students to bring up subjects that concerned them for classroom discussion." (p. 23).

If the program had a language-based philosophy of reading, and used a language experience approach to teaching reading and writing, the materials actually came from the students themselves -- based on their experiences. Many feel that materials be selected based on the learners' needs and interests. For example, Valentine (1985) suggests that materials should be derived from an analysis of the learners' daily environment -- workplace, home, and community.

Newman and Eyster (1981), under the auspices of the International Reading Association's Basic Education and Reading (BEAR) committee, developed an evaluation checklist to be used when reviewing adult materials. The authors developed this checklist with the input from various adult literacy program providers at various conferences with the hopes that "...it will be helpful to adult educators, administrators, volunteer tutors, librarians, and others -- in fact, anyone who must select reading materials for adult learners." (p. 701). From this extensive review process, the authors identified 10 criteria, along with sub-questions for each heading, to rate adult literacy materials. The criteria are detailed below with abbreviated versions of the sub-questions in parenthesis:

* appeal (fresh, enjoyable, interesting)
* relevance (depicts adult life experiences)
* purpose (states broad goals or specific objectives)
* process (prereading experiences, word analysis, comprehension)
* human relations (depicts ethnic/racial gender in positive way)
* evaluation (provides pre- and post-test, and monitoring)
* function of material (encourages wide reading, suggests resources, contains answer keys)
* format (appear attractive, suitable illustrations)
* teacher directions (instructions offered both teacher/student)
* content (selections short enough to hold interest, appropriate reading level, promotes comprehension, writing activities)

The authors included a quantitative formula and related scale to evaluate the material's usability with particular students.

Information from the previous sections indicates that material selection is a function of program philosophy and goals. Although problems surrounding the availability of quality materials for adults -- both native English and second language learners -- still exist, the research recommends that materials be selected (or locally developed) with the learners' goals in mind. This will not only improve the learners chances for improving their literacy skills, but for staying in the program as well.

TESTING AND EVALUATION

Testing and Evaluation

What Pre-Post Tests are Used?

A program's choice of testing instruments -- like the choice of materials -- is related to program goals and, to some extent, definitions of literacy (Crandall et al., 1984; Johnson, 1985). The authors noted three patterns of test use categorized by literacy sectors. Thus, local ABE's, community based organizations, corrections, and postsecondary programs depended heavily on standardized tests such as the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE), Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT), Botell Reading Inventory, and the Stanford and California Reading Tests. Echoing this view is Lytle, Mormor, & Penner, (1986), who point out that the TABE and the Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE) are often cited as the two assessment instruments most frequently used in adult literacy programs. (p. 13).

The second pattern of test use noted by Crandall et al. (1984), relates to military programs which combine standardized tests (TABE, WRAT, CAT, and the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery) to measure literacy skills and non-standardized measures (criterion-referenced tests) to diagnose specific skills as they relate to military tasks. (p. 159).

Finally, the third pattern of test use uncovered by Crandall reflects the employment and training programs surveyed. As the authors note, "... emphasis is not on a generalized improvement of skills, but on developing specific skills which enable clients to get and keep jobs." (p. 160). Although these patterns were identified, the authors caution that, for instance, 30-40 percent of the ABE and community based programs also used criterion-referenced instruments and still others (especially in California), used the CASAS competency-based assessment system.

On this same note, Phillips et al. (1985), analyzed 15 adult literacy programs and found that the use of test materials falls into three categories

1. jobs-oriented programs
2. human development programs
3. programs with empowerment philosophies

The authors state, "In jobs-oriented programs, teachers utilized standardized testing materials to assess and diagnose student's progress and choose teaching methodologies. In these programs, students had little or no involvement in their own placement or in the development of their educational goals." (p. 22).

In programs that focused on human development, testing was considered less important. "Testing was primarily used for placement testing, to document progress for funding purposes, or for diagnosing instructional needs. In the latter case, testing procedures were adapted to meet the individual student's needs for particular kinds of information. In programs stressing empowerment philosophies, testing was not considered important by directors or teachers, although it was used for placement for collecting statistics that

funding sources required." (p. 22).

More and more community-based organizations and library-based literacy programs are experimenting with non-standardized measures for evaluating learner progress. For instance, in the California Literacy Campaign, the California State Library has instituted the California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Procedure that focuses on learners' literacy habits, learners' perceptions of reading and writing progress, and goal-attainment as measures of progress, (Solorzano & Stecher, 1988).

In a study of California's adult literacy delivery system, SRA (1987) found with regard to test use that "Adult schools and community colleges tended to rely on standardized competency-based assessment instruments, while libraries and community-based organizations were more likely to use a variety of formal and informal assessment methods." (p. 82).

Concerns regarding the appropriateness of tests for measuring adult learners has been raised. Kazemek (1988) notes that "... some of the diagnostic tests commonly used with adults -- for example, the Slosson Oral Reading Test ... were developed for children, not adults." (p. 465). Along this same line, Lytle et al. (1986) note that the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) "... is the California Test of Basic Skills rewritten in adult language." (p. 13). Greenleigh Associates reported in 1966 that "The achievement and intelligence tests used in this field test lacked reliability and validity for this adult population. These were neither geared to the knowledge base of the students nor standardized with this population."(Quoted in Brown & Newman, 1970).

Are Learners Pre-Post Tested?

Although literacy programs use a variety of tests -- both standard and informal -- few are pleased with the utility of such tests.

One of the more informative discussions of test use in adult literacy programs is contained in the study by Crandall et al. (1984). They discovered that all of the programs in their national survey used some form of test...as a matter of fact "Almost one-third of the 225 programs queried rank diagnosis as the most important component in their program." (p. 3-48). Reporting similar findings, Phillips et al. (1985) also concluded that, "All fifteen programs in the study were involved in some form of assessment and diagnosis ..."

Solorzano and Stecher (1987) found that of 45 California Literacy Campaign program coordinators surveyed regarding learner assessment procedures, most noted oral reading as being assessed upon entry into the program while the second most common area was sight vocabulary followed by decoding skills, phonics and comprehension. However, post assessments were conducted only about 50% of the time.

In a study of adult schools, community colleges, library-based literacy programs and community-based programs in California, SRA (1987) found that certain trends among these service delivery areas regarding test use were

apparent, although "Few programs engaged in formal pre-post testing for adult literacy students." (p. 84).

Most programs conduct some form of initial diagnosis of learners upon entry into the program. Equating early diagnosis with the efficient use of time, Havrilesky notes that this form of testing is a key factor in successful programs. (Quoted in Balmuth 1987, p. 12). Balmuth (1987) stresses that the initial diagnosis of learners' needs should be conducted "... by someone skilled in reading diagnosis." (p. 13).

Echoing this sentiment, Greenleigh Associates (1969) note in their study of adult basic education programs in New Jersey, that the lack of an academic background of instructional staff to be able to diagnose the kinds of difficulties students were having put instructional staff at a disadvantage.

How is Performance Monitored?

Monitoring learner progress is an important activity of adult literacy programs. As the U.S. Department of Education notes, "Adult literacy students are usually as eager as their teachers to find out how they are doing. Effective programs give progress reports to and share test results with students." (p. 49). Thus the authors recommend that programs regularly assess the students' progress and let them know, in an encouraging way, how they are doing.

In many cases, learners' performance is monitored by their progress through the program's selected workbooks or texts. For instance, Laubach Way to Reading materials (popular with many CBOs and library-based literacy programs) have built-in "check-ups" after each book that monitors learner progress. Many commercially developed materials also have end-of-the-unit tests that monitor learners' progress.

In many cases, programs re-administer a standardized test to learners after so many hours of instruction. These "post-tests" usually are administered at 50 or 100 hour intervals.

Solorzano and Stecher (1987) found when reviewing the progress monitoring procedures of 45 library-based adult literacy programs that "A vast majority of the CLC coordinators indicated that regular monitoring took place in the following skill areas: comprehension, decoding, oral reading, sight vocabulary and phonics. Half of these coordinators mentioned using the Laubach Way to Reading "check-ups" as a method of monitoring adult learner progress." (p. 14). Other informal methods such as interviews, observations, and materials such as Merrill Linguistics, Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and San Diego Quick Assessment (SDQA) were used to varying degrees. The authors found that writing and mathematics progress was monitored less frequently.

Programs using competency-based instructional systems keep a constant pulse on learner progress. In California, for example, programs using the CASAS system can monitor learner progress by following the steps outlined in the CBAE Assessment System which includes:

* developing individual student profiles,
* establishing a placement process that includes assessment of both basic and life skills and focuses on student goals and needs,
* establishing a system for monitoring student and group progress, including a record keeping system, and
* establishing criteria and implementing assessment procedures for student movement to the next level or for certification upon exiting the program.

How is the Program Evaluated?

What is Evaluation? Evaluation is an important component to program operations, and for adult literacy programs, it is receiving more attention (Dusewicz, Biester & Kenney, 1987; Koen, Musumeci, Weeks & Capalbo, 1985). Dusewicz et al. (1987) describe evaluation as "...the process of selecting, collecting, and interpreting information needed for decision making. It is essentially research applied to decision making." (p. 4). In essence, the process is especially important as Koen et al. (1985) note: "It is especially important that four evaluation elements be clear: why you want to evaluate, what you want to evaluate, to what extent you want to evaluate, and how you want to evaluate." (p. 1).

Mayer (1985) points out that a literacy program should undertake an annual review of its operations to determine the degree to which its mission and goals are reflected in the program's activities and results. With regard to evaluating learner progress, he proposes five areas of examination:

1. personal literacy goal attainment
2. reading skills
3. self-confidence
4. economic/employment status
5. lifelong learning

Crandall et al. (1984) asked program leaders to define evaluation and they mentioned two methods, "... formal record keeping and internal monitoring of program operation." (p. 252). In essence, most program directors seemed to relate program evaluation as the record keeping process necessary to complete yearly or quarterly reports to funding agencies.

Research suggests that there are other distinctions to be made when evaluating programs. Some feel that one must make the differentiation between program evaluation and personnel evaluation (Willing, 1989). The former focuses on program considerations while the latter focuses on the performance of individual staff persons within the program. Both are important to program management, but do not necessarily need to be conducted during the same evaluation cycle.

Seen in a positive light, program evaluation can serve as a constructive component that addresses program strengths and weaknesses. As Willing (1989)

recommends, "After a program is in place, the effective administrator will want to assess whether the program has been implemented as intended, and further, whether it is having the desired results." (p. 4). The author continues, "A healthy, effective program will regularly diagnose problems, seek solutions and employ strategies for change and improvement." (p. 4).

In an adult literacy program in Horry County, South Carolina, an ongoing evaluation design was put in place for the duration of the project. The Final Evaluation Report states, "An evaluator for the project met quarterly with [project staff] for three years to collect and analyze the materials and direct [the project's] efforts. He submitted a written report each year and at the end of the project." (p. 18). Information for this evaluation was gathered on students, tutors, community, and project staff.

A report by the U.S. Department of Education (1988) recommends that "Student assessment and program evaluation should be ongoing ... yet unfortunately, many adult literacy programs don't collect student assessment and program evaluation data in a systematic way." (p. 53).

The next section will discuss the types of data the literature recommends programs should collect with examples of some programs that are evaluating their activities.

What needs to be evaluated and how? Yet although most agree that evaluation is important, minimal program evaluation has been conducted. Johnson (1985) notes that "enhancing the scope and quality of the national [literacy] effort is presently hampered by what McCune (1984) aptly calls 'a huge void in the descriptive data about literacy programs' ... little detailed information is available telling 'who is delivering these programs, what they do, how many are served, how well they work, what they cost, how they are funded, and what unmet needs they might have. Student data are in equally short supply with regard to levels of performance, rate of growth, and benefits derived from various instructional approaches." (p. 19).

When data are available, in some cases their interpretation is misleading. For instance, Diekhoff (1988) suggests that "With few exceptions ... published evaluations of adult literacy training have presented an overly optimistic view of the effectiveness of these programs." (p. 624). Diekhoff describes the major data sources of program evaluation as the following:

* data documenting program need
* program usage and growth data
* anecdotal, case study data
* student and tutor self-reports
* quality of life data

Others have described the nature of the evaluation for library literacy programs (Johnson, 1986), and similarities to Diekhoff's categories are apparent. For instance, Johnson points out that statistics on the number of students participating in the program, use of materials, percentage of increase in the use of the library, number of tutors trained, number of referrals to the project, amount of interagency cooperation, and changes in

students' lives are components of such evaluations.

Evaluations can include both quantitative and qualitative information about program effectiveness. Johnson reported on a study of the American Library Association (1978), and found numerous data sources for retrieving qualitative information for program evaluation purposes. Some common methods for gathering qualitative data identified by Johnson included the following:

1. surveys
2. observations
3. anecdotal reports of participants' use and behaviors in libraries
4. case studies
5. student evaluation of personally set goals
6. student reports on changes in their lives
7. follow-up of learner progress via phone calls and personal interviews
8. progress reports by tutors
9. staff evaluations
10. continued existence
11. continued funding

While evaluating library literacy programs in California, Lane et al. (1984) attempted to ascertain three questions: 1) How effective has the California Literacy Campaign (CLC) been in reaching and teaching functionally illiterate adults? 2) To what extent is the local community prepared and able to continue the adult literacy program relying exclusively on local resources? and 3) To what extent have the individual projects been implemented according to the program design or derived from the principles explicated in the design prepared by the California State Library (CSL) staff?

Using a discrepancy model (Provus, 1971), and measures of client satisfaction, Lane et al. (1984) concluded that "In six to eight months, most CLC projects had accomplished what it often has taken volunteer literacy programs two years or more to accomplish." (p. 47). In this sense, the evaluation was formative, in that it monitored the implementation of the programs to determine if they were conducting the activities that they proposed in their initial grants.

Two years later, Wurzbacher and Yeannakis (1986) sought to answer two program questions about the California Literacy Campaign: 1) To what extent were the functional literacy skills of adult learners improved by their participation in local library literacy programs? and 2) To what extent were the lives of adult learners enhanced by their participation in local library literacy programs? These evaluation questions are examples of outcome (summative) measures.

By using reports based on interviews with tutors and adult learners the authors concluded that, "As a group and in relation to a number of different measures, adult learners and tutors involved in Program Effectiveness Review II left little doubt that most adult learners who participate in California Literacy Campaign (CLC) local library literacy programs evidence functional

skills improvement ... and ... the majority of adult learners ... experience some change in their lives as a result of the literacy program experience ..." (p. 62).

Similarly, Crandall et al. (1984) report that literacy programs in their sample usually mentioned collecting the following data for annual or quarterly reports:

* student test scores
* hours of attendance for each student
* completions
* dropouts
* number of graduates
* demographics and ethnicity
* goal attainment statistics

Crandall notes that even though programs were reporting these data to their respective funding sources, the information should also be used for planning, troubleshooting and monitoring trends. Yet, in most cases, evaluation meant "the state form." (p. 269). Unfortunately, most evaluations are seen as satisfying an outsiders (e.g., state, federal, other funding sources) needs for statistical information. Yet evaluations are actually very useful for the local programs as well. Willing (1989) echoes this sentiment by asking "Are the efforts to evaluate students, personnel, facilities and dollars combined into effective decision-making?" (p. 4).

If the program evaluation is to be relevant to the local site, the program director should take an active role in the evaluation process. During their site visitations Crandall et al. (1984), found that directors identified various roles as they relate to program evaluation. They included the director as:

* primary record keeper
* manager of a network to integrate data from other sites
* program manager who keeps in constant contact with staff
* primary planner ... who uses evaluation data to make decisions

This latter role highlights the importance of using evaluation data to assist in local program planning and decision making.

The California competency-based education program, which uses the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), was evaluated in 1987. California passed a "mandate" in 1982 requiring all agencies who wished to receive Section 306 funding (under provisions of the Adult Education Act), to use a competency-based educational system. The time frame for implementation was three years, thus, the need to assess the progress of the mandate became apparent to the Adult Education Field Services Unit. (p. 1). The purpose of this evaluation was to answer the following two questions:

1) How have Section 306 agency personnel interpreted the CBAE mandate?

2) What have been the effects of the CBAE mandate on agency management, classroom functioning, and student outcomes?

This evaluation was both formative and summative in nature and resulted in program staff receiving valuable program information in the following nine areas:

1) identification of competencies
2) use of student profiles
3) monitoring of student progress
4) documentation of student competency attainment
5) placement of students in program (appropriate levels)
6) counseling
7) appropriate uses of instructional materials
8) use of a variety of teaching strategies
9) development of staff development program

Information from these nine areas helped the State Department of Education determine how the competency-based mandate had been implemented and the effect it was having on learners and program staff. Based on data from this evaluation certain areas (e.g., identification of competencies) were being implemented well, however other areas (e.g., counseling services to ESL students) needed more attention. A successful evaluation can highlight areas of success as well as areas of need.

A Quality Standards for Adult Education Programs guide was developed by six State Directors of Adult Education in order to: 1) develop a common core of quality standards and elements for managing adult education programs, 2) design an instrument which could measure quality standards and elements, and 3) improve program practices for achieving excellence in adult education programs. The guide covers the following program areas:

* administration
* planning
* facilities
* instruction
* staff development
* community involvement
* public relations
* evaluation
* student services

The adult education committee, chaired by Dr. Towey of the Division of Adult Education, U.S. Office of Vocational and Adult Education, notes that by applying this guide in local program reviews, various strengths and weaknesses could be identified for program improvement. Also, the National Diffusion Network has design a stringent evaluation procedure for identifying exemplary programs that weighs three components based on a 15 page report submitted by the candidate program. The components are: 1) program's impact on student, 2)

program evaluation, and 3) replication.

What Makes a Successful Program?

This section will review components that the literature suggests make for a successful program or have been identified in program evaluations. In Section II (Telephone Survey) of this report, an additional discussion of successful practices will be presented.

Program effectiveness or success is related to factors mentioned in the previous section on evaluation outcomes. In essence, programs are identifying various program and learner outcomes to portray their program's success. Thus, many programs have used quantitative measures to document hours of instruction, recruitment, program growth, job referrals, etc., as program success indicators.

For example, Crandall et al. (1984) mention that the effective programs in their study noted hours of attendance, completions, dropouts, number of graduates, and goal attainment as success areas. They also mention that "There is general acceptance that the use of retention and completion data do show effectiveness." (p. 251).

Barss, Reitzel, and Associates (1972), (quoted in Johnson, 1986), found -- based on their survey of library reading projects -- the following sixteen indicators of success were uncovered:

1. increase in average attendance
2. 90 to 100 percent regular attendance
3. increase in regular attendance
4. cooperation with community agencies
5. program director's judgement of project benefits accrued
6. changes in library use (e.g., circulation, number and type of users, types of materials circulated)
7. changes in library operation (e.g., policies, budget allocations)
8. requests for program expansion
9. program staff reactions
10. nonprogram staff reaction
11. inquiries about the program from other libraries or groups
12. adoption of program by at least one other library
13. program director's citation that the program met its goals
14. program director's view of effect of program on library, participants, and community
15. total attendance at all sites of 1000 or more
16. change in participants' skills or behavior

As one can see from this list, many of the success factors deal with program attendance data, the director's judgement of the program's success, changes in library services, outside referrals, and finally, learner skills improvement. These factors are not necessarily ranked by importance, but the data do give a broad view of outcome measures for evaluating program success.

In a study of 54 rural exemplary programs, Hone (1984) identified a sample of effective practices to include:

* the use of videos and forms of technology for instruction and program management,
* use of qualified community members as part-time faculty,
* use of mobile classrooms,
* use of "career vans" that go out to the community and provide academic counseling,
* provide transportation for learners to and from instructional sites or other program locations,
* corporate scholarships provided to students,
* use of peer teachers, and
* use of home cable T.V. video lessons (on subscription basis).

The successful features of these programs seem to reflect the "need for communication" aspect inherent in rural situations. For instance, providing transportation, mobile classrooms etc., show the need to reach out to the students. The need for flexible policies -- since students need to overcome transportation, weather or communications problems to come to class -- is an important consideration for rural programs.

Yet others are more skeptical of data not directly related to learners reading improvement. For example, Diekhoff (1988) states that "Any evaluation that fails to document reading improvements has failed to document program effectiveness." (p. 627). Still others have found that "affective" outcomes are just as important as quantitative measures. (Crandall et al. 1984; Darkenwald & Valentine, 1985; Heathington, 1987).

Yet, determining success of adult literacy programs is indeed philosophic (depending on one's definition of adult literacy) and to some degree, controversial. Interestingly, Crandall et al. (1984) state that "Our conversations with literacy educators underscore the fact that they share no common criteria for measuring success. Standards of success range from attracting high numbers of recruits to making fundamental changes in people's lives." (p. 336). This study found that few directors could describe their methods or standards for judging program effectiveness. Consequently, measuring program success is a controversial issue in terms of the lack of agreement about the standards by which success can be judged as well as the problematic issue it creates for most literacy programs fighting for their share of highly competitive resources. (p. 337).

The California Competency-Based Adult Education evaluation documented success by noting that procedures for implementing CASAS had been followed -- especially by "high-implementing" programs and that many programs had accomplished, to varying degrees, the following:

* identified competencies,
* increased the number of programs developing student profiles,
* increased the number of programs using the CASAS Survey Achievement Test,

* most agencies had established a structured system for placing students in programs,
* increased use of appropriate materials,
* increased use of a variety of teaching strategies, and
* increased staff development opportunities.

Many programs document the changes in learners' reading level as indicators of success. For instance Pasch and Oakley (1985) noted that learners increased ..... grade levels after 100 hours of instruction. The CBAE evaluation study noted that "high implementing" program students achieved a greater average gain on the CASAS Survey Achievement Test than students from the "low implementing" agencies after 100 hours of instruction.

Darkenwald and Valentine (1985) found "success" to be different from grade-level increases when viewed by the learners themselves. In a study of adult learners in New Jersey's adult basic skills education program they asked learners what impact the program had on their subsequent reading, writing, and mathematics improvement. They also asked questions about learners' job status, impact on their families, and other affective outcomes of participating in the program. The authors found that successful outcomes from the learners' point of view were not necessarily related to the job or even skills development, but the most important benefit was related to affective outcomes like "enhanced self-confidence or self-esteem." (p. 22).

OUTREACH AND RECRUITMENT

Outreach and Recruitment

How Do "Hard-to-Reach" Illiterate Adults Find Out About Literacy Programs?

Attracting the "hard-to-reach" adult learner is a difficult task. Johnson (1985) reports that, "As numerous studies emphasize, ABE programs operating through the public system, and national volunteer programs, operating primarily with middle-class volunteers, have both tended to attract only the 'cream' of the illiterate population, those already comfortable enough with traditional educational norms to self-select into such programs and who are most easily served: most motivated and higher up on the educational ladder." (p. 7).

Thus, to recruit the hard-to-reach learner takes a special effort. Successful programs attract the "hard-to-reach" learner not by accident, but through careful planning. Yet this is easier said than done. Lehr (1983) notes that "we must find ways to attract more illiterate adults to literacy programs. To do this, program developers need a better understanding of who the illiterate are, what their needs are, and how they view themselves." (p. 117).

Getting a better understanding of who needs literacy instruction and what their needs are may differ from location to location. For instance, Balmuth (1987) notes that since "...the specifics of practical needs differ from community to community, ABE program planning should include a survey to determine those needs for the prospective program clientele, provide the most feasible means to meet them, and make sure that those provisions are clearly and sensitively communicated as part of any recruitment process." (p. 8). The importance of needs assessments geared to help programs identify potential clients is also supported by Crandall et al. (1984), who note in their survey of adult literacy programs that a needs assessment "...provides essential data on the demographic, economic, and cultural characteristics of an area in which a program hopes to operate. By conducting an assessment, a program can ensure where and for whom literacy training is needed." (p. 113).

This point was also highlighted in a study conducted on a statewide library-based adult literacy campaign. In analyzing the "least successful" and "most successful" adult literacy projects regarding student and tutor recruitment, Lane et al. (1984), found that projects having the most trouble getting students are projects which:

1. had not identified specific student target populations initially,
2. had not attempted any nontraditional publicity efforts aimed at students,
3. did not have a coalition in each community in which they are working, and
4. had fewer learning sites -- and most or all were located in libraries.

The authors suggest that "It would seem that the projects need to re-do

or refine their needs assessment activities." (p. 48).

Therefore, based on an initial needs assessment, most effective programs plan their recruitment strategies. Balmuth (1987) suggests four activities for recruitment: 1) door-to-door or telephone canvassing, 2) print and media publicity, 3) referrals from established institutions, and 4) referrals from business and industry.

Although these strategies are generally accepted as successful, how they are implemented and for whom these strategies are targeted can make a difference. For instance, some suggest that with undereducated hard-to-reach adults, "personal sources are more effective than non-personal." Whereas information disseminated through the media "serves well-educated people best." (Bock, 1980; Cross, 1978).

The "message" printed materials present to learners is very important. Recruitment messages should be honest with the learners relative to what they can do. For example, Smith (1989) warns that "Literacy does not guarantee jobs or a better life...no matter how extravagant the claims made for it."(p. 358). Thus, recruitment messages should present a "realistic yet hopeful" picture of the possibilities." (Balmuth, 1987, p. 9). Crandall et al. (1984) also caution that "When programs promise what they cannot realistically deliver, when they create potentially long waiting lists, when they fail to meet the needs of the diversity of learners they solicit, they put a 'break' in the first link of the program chain." (p. 105).

Hone (1984) notes that recruitment literature in rural areas was "refreshingly free of technical post-secondary jargon such as 'matriculation' and 'articulation' or the like." (p. 16).

Part of conveying a realistic picture to adults and possibly getting good results is to let them know -- through the program's recruitment literature -- that certain "situational barriers" (Cross, 1978), will be addressed by the program -- if of course the program does provide such services. Situational barriers as described by Cross are "those arising from one's situation in life, such as lack of time due to job and home responsibilities, lack of money or child care, and lack of transportation." (See Lehr, 1983, pp. 177-178). These barriers are indeed real for many hard-to-reach adults. For instance, Fitzgerald (1984) notes -- after interviewing 100 adults from a midwestern slum area -- that "... the hard core illiterate's most pressing needs are primarily of an economic, social and psychological nature. Until these needs are met, these adults cannot be expected to register in ABE programs." (p. 27). Wallerstein (1984) confirms that successful programs have recruitment advertizement messages that stress upfront that programs provide child care, transportation or even counseling to potential participants.

Situational barriers for rural learners include geographical distances, severe climate fluctuations, inadequate public transportation, sparse populations and limited communication systems (Hone, 1984). Thus, recruitment literature in rural areas needs to address these issues as well.

Another message that the printed material should emphasize is the unique nature of adult education and anonymity. For instance, the recruitment message should stress the difference between the program's adult learning activities and traditional school programs (Knowles, 1980; Darling, 1981) as well as emphasize the confidential nature of the program (Resnick & Robinson, 1975; Darling, 1981). Because many illiterate adults do not see themselves as having a problem coping with every day situations, Darling suggests that the recruitment appeal should concentrate on employment, children, and basic skills. Again, care must be taken on what the program promises learners in relationship to employment and subsequent successes (Smith, 1989).

A study by the U.S. Department of Education supports some of the above findings by noting that:

> * Recommendations of friends and peers in the community and in the workplace are believed by many to be most effective.
>
> * Testimonials from successful program alumni, current students, and program staff also have credibility.
>
> * Advertisements in newspaper and magazines and on posters are seen by many...
>
> * Public service announcements on popular radio stations and television reach millions.

This latter method (radio and TV PSA's) has been supported by other research as well as a viable method for recruiting adults. Smith-Burke (1989) found when interviewing a small sample of low-level adult readers in New York that radio and television advertisements were the major means that learners found out about the program. Although the author used a small sample, the findings do support the hypothesis that adults who cannot read, do not tell their peers or friends, thus word-of-mouth might not be the best way to recruit the hardest to reach.

<u>How are The Nonliterate Language Majority and Language Minority Populations Recruited?</u>

There is little direction provided by the literature regarding the recruitment of language minority populations. In essence, the nonliterate language majority learner is the "hard-to-reach" which was discussed in the previous section. Yet methods for attracting language minority populations are limited to translations of posters and flyers, and radio PSAs on favorite Spanish speaking radio stations. In some instances churches and organizations that are trusted by specific minority populations are contacted to provide learners. In either case, a few studies have uncovered some successful tactics.

Supporting the use of media to recruit beginning readers from specific minority backgrounds, Stauffer (1980) found that "employer [referrals] and television were the high percent categories for [recruiting] Blacks..." Similarly suggesting the importance of the media for attracting certain language minority groups, Crandall et al. (1984) noted that Public Service Announcements (PSAs) on Spanish speaking radios, or popular rock, soul or reggae stations can be successful for certain minority learners. Also, because of the dispersion of learners, radio and television ads are effective in rural areas (Crandall et al. 1984).

Crandall et al. (1984) also reported that the adult literacy programs that they surveyed tried to target minority populations "through community bulletins, or through employers in industries that hire low-skill labor." (p. 107).

The media, though effective, must be viewed with caution. For example, timing of radio PSAs must be synchronized with program recruitment timelines, otherwise programs will receive calls after the recruitment has been conducted and may be unable to serve the overflow of requests. Also, the program needs to judge the geographic area that the PSA message will cover. In some cases, learners from miles away will hear the message, yet be unable to reach the literacy program office because of transportation problems, thus again putting the program in an awkward position, and perhaps hurting its reputation in the community.

<u>What Media or Printed Material Strategies Do Programs Use to Recruit Volunteer Tutors, Community Groups, Social Service Agencies, and Other Support Services That Will Benefit the Learner?</u>

Like Balmuth, Crandall et al. (1984) note the importance of print such as newspapers, posters, brochures, flyers, and bulletins when done in "simple ... easy to read language" in recruiting both tutors and learners. Again, careful planning on just how these printed materials will convey the "right" message to potential participants must be considered. Eggert (1984) notes that "...[the] style of recruitment posters, who answers the [program office] phone and how, and who endorses the program, will each have an impact on who is served and how." (pp. 8-9).

Although, some studies have noted that learners first hear about literacy programs via the radio or television, the SRA study (1987) found during their interviews with program personnel that PROJECT PLUS [PSAs] was seen as much more effective in recruiting volunteer tutors than in recruiting adult learners into literacy programs. Supporting this finding, Mikulecky (1986) reports on the evaluation of the Advertising Council's <u>Volunteer Against Illiteracy</u> program, conducted by Newman (1986). He notes that "... 8000 of the new teachers and 10,000 of the new students came to literacy programs via the special 800 telephone number set up by the advertizing campaign." (p. 22).

In an evaluation of the Horry County Reading Crusade, Quickel and Wise (1982) gathered information on tutors and reported that tutors were recruited through the following strategies:

* the use of T.V. spot announcements
* newspaper articles
* church bulletin inserts
* word of mouth

Wurzbacher and Yeannakis (1986) reported that tutors heard about the library-based program from the broadcast media or the public library. This is similar to the findings of Pasch and Oakley (1985) who discovered that tutors first heard about Project LEARN "from sources --- the newspaper (48), family member or friend (46), publicity on T.V. (32), and announcements at churches (26).

Recruitment efforts can also be directed at social service agencies, community groups, and employers. These groups can assist in "spreading the word" among adults needing literacy services (Crandall et al. 1984; Waite, 1984). Also, forming meaningful relationships with these community sectors can strengthen the program's network within the different community agencies.

National efforts at creating networks among the major stakeholders in adult literacy have proved successful since in many cases programs realized that "... cooperation among the diverse stakeholders -- policy makers, funders, providers, and consumers -- is essential to developing and sustaining the resources necessary to meet the needs of adult learners cost effectively." (Williams, 1988, p. 4).

In addition to providing community agencies printed material, literacy program staff can make presentations to the organizations and community groups. However, recruitment efforts directed to established institutions must be carefully planned to include provisions for follow-up on requested services -- otherwise these efforts may show disappointing results (Greenleigh Associates, 1969; Long, 1981). Yet the potential for referrals from agencies is great. Irish (1980) found that "agency referral was the single most effective recruitment tool among those used in urban areas." (p. 47). Others have also found that networking with educational and social service agencies, with whom the literacy program has maintained a relationship, is beneficial (August & Havrilesky, 1983).

Employers and unions can be a valuable resource for recruitment (Stauffer, 1980), especially if "respectable employment" is the message (or possibility) linked to the recruitment effort (Irish, 1980) or a possible by-product (Crandall et al. 1984). Although employers seem to be a natural for literacy referrals especially given the benefits of having a literate workforce (U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Labor, 1987), Darling (1981) cautions that this may not be a good practice since many employed literacy students hide their reading deficiencies from their employers.

What Different Kinds of Outreach and Recruitment Approaches Do Programs Use?

As with media, word-of-mouth is an effective technique in recruiting hard-to-reach learners, yet how it is done and from whose mouth the message comes can be important. It is suggested that programs can be more effective if the person providing the message is from the adult's peer group (Mulve, 1969), a friend or relative (Stauffer, 1973), a current student in the program (Greenleigh Associates, 1969), or a former program student (Darling, 1981; Crandall et al., 1984). Word-of-mouth techniques have great potential for recruiting minorities (Crandall et al., 1984). The authors suggest that "In this day and age, the reputation [of the literacy program] on the street level is extremely important...Rumors about the consistent poor performance of tutors or teachers escapes easily into the community grapevine." (p. 116). Crandall et al. 1984 quote another literacy program director as stating, "quality sells itself." (p. 116).

Similar to door-to-door canvasing, Irish (1980) found that home visits to recruit learners for the ABE program showed better results compared to recruitment methods using flyers or word-of-mouth.

Lane et al. (1984) asked adults participating in the library-based California Literacy Campaign how they first found out about the program and the most common response was television (25%), a family member (13%, the library (11%), a friend (11%), radio (9%), and school or teacher (9%).

Two years later, Wurzbacher and Yeannakis (1986) surveyed a sample of 104 adult learners participating in the California Literacy Campaign (CLC) and found that two-thirds of the participants first heard about the literacy program either through the broadcast media or from people close to them in their lives, thus supporting Lane's findings.

Pasch and Oakely (1985) asked their sample of 181 adult learners "How did you first hear of Project LEARN." (p. 9). "... a majority of the students responded "family member, friend" (39), followed by "television" (26), and "social service agency" (10).

In the SRA study of adult schools, community colleges, library-based and community based programs, they found that "word-of-mouth was the most effective means of recruitment for all four service delivery areas." (p. 78). For adult schools, PSAs and stories in newspapers was the second best recruitment strategy. For community colleges, posters served their purposes of recruitment second to word-of-mouth. For libraries, T.V. and newspaper PSAs equally attracted learners, while posters were second best recruiters for CBOs.

In the final analysis, programs need to initially conduct a needs assessment identifying learners' needs, where they live, community resources, and to plan the literacy program's plan of action to address the learners' needs. It appears, that when programs are viewed by the community as viable, and successful, the program takes on a life of its own. As Crandall et al. (1984) state, "Surprisingly, limited recruitment may be a sign of a very successful program -- a program that has analyzed its strengths, has targeted

those learners it can help, and has built its community reputation on delivering what it promises." (p. 117). On the other hand, limited recruitment may also mean that the demand for literacy services exceeds the supply (or capabilities of the provider) regardless of program quality. In California, for instance, ABE and community college programs rarely need to recruit for ESL classes since they are filled to capacity.

LEARNER RETENTION

Learner Retention

Once programs have successfully recruited learners, they need to keep them in the program. Attrition rates in adult literacy programs range from 30% to 60%. Harman (1984) suggests that half of the adults in literacy programs drop out. Since most adult literacy programs are open entry/exit programs, learners are basically free to come and go as they please. Thus if programs are not meeting basic needs -- academic and/or social -- adults will leave. The SRA study in California found that "Once students overcame the obstacles and managed to enroll in a literacy program, significant numbers failed to stay with the program." (p. 79).

Harris (1984) suggests that "... retention of students is a function of the quality of the services the student receives; that is usually indicated by the precision with which the student is matched with the tutor, and the degree to which the student's tutoring sessions are scheduled at a place and time that is comfortable for that student." (p. 12). The author feels the same for tutor retention as well, "Similarly, the retention of volunteers is a function of the quality of staff support that they get and the volunteers' perception of the strength of the organization and management of the local literacy council." (p. 12).

Crandall et al. (1984) note an interesting aspect to the retention problem that deals with program staff's perceptions of low retention rates. While surveying program staff regarding this issue, the authors note that 65% of the 164 respondents mentioned that they had retention problems with dropout rates of above 30%. Although this figure is relatively low, the authors find it interesting that programs with a 30% dropout rate still feel that learner retention is a problem. Noting that 57 of their respondents did not feel that they had a retention problem -- and further analyses found that only 3 of these programs had dropout rates exceeding 30% -- the authors conclude that "...it appears that program staff have a clearer idea when retention is <u>not</u> a problem than when it is a problem." (p. 40).

However, despite this perceptual problem, figures for dropouts seem to be well documented. For instance, Bowren (1987) notes that for many programs, 39% of the participants drop out before the 19th hour of instruction. She adds that the percentage increases to 60% by the 39th hour and to 90% by the 99th hour of instruction. The SRA study found that adult schools, community colleges and libraries in their California sample reported that the average length of time adult learners stay in literacy programs runs between seven and nine months while for CBOs the average is eighteen months. (p. 79). Others have noted the CBO's ability to retain a relatively higher percentage of learners in their programs than do ABE programs -- 65-70 percent compared to 25-50 percent for mainstream programs. (BCEL, 1986).

Reasons Learners Leave Program

Realizing that dropout rates for adults are high, determining the reasons learners leave is still somewhat illusive. There is still a question as to whether learners leave programs for personal reasons or if they are

dissatisfied with the program (e.g., tutor, materials, instruction, etc.). Yet over twenty years ago, Houle (1964) found five reasons -- that seem to apply today -- why learners leave adult literacy programs. They are:

1. students accomplish goals,
2. students have low basic aptitudes and cannot keep up with their work,
3. personal problems,
4. students are dissatisfied with instruction, and
5. students are dissatisfied with administrative policies. (p. 226).

Balmuth (1987) notes that "Researchers tend to conclude that withdrawal is less often a failure of the program itself than a result of outside forces, although factors within the program may play a part." (p. 30). Smith-Burke (1987) asked adults in her study why they dropped out of other literacy programs in which they formerly participated. The respondents faulted the programs and characterized them as being insensitive or educationally ineffective ... or they noted personal reasons such as moving, needing child care, or having to leave for financial reasons.

Pasch and Oakley (1985) asked tutors why they thought learners left the program. The greatest number of responses indicated that, "Lack of motivation, discouragement (26%), followed by "employment reasons, tutor left program, family problems, health reasons, moved, -- all of which accounted for 5% to 15% of the responses." (p. 4).

Cross (1978) provides a framework from which to describe the different barriers to learner participation in literacy programs. When she reviewed 30 studies of participation in adult education, she found that the obstacles deterring participants fell into the following three broad categories:

1. Situational Barriers (lack of time, money, child care, transportation)
2. Dispositional barriers (learner's attitude and perception of own learning potential)
3. Institutional barriers (inconvenient scheduling, fees, course offerings, locations)

Cross cautions that addressing situational and institutional barriers only, will not necessarily result in successful retention or participation rates.

The importance of dispositional barriers was highlighted in a study by Fingeret (1982), where she surveyed 40 urban illiterate adults and found that these learners had a negative image of "literate people." While respondents wanted to know how to read and write, several were proud of their "common sense" learning contrasted to "book learning."

A study by the U.S. Department of Education (1988) notes the importance of "circumstances" in the lives of the learners as having a direct effect on their attendance. The authors note "Circumstance may have a significant

effect on attendance and sustained participation of adult students in literacy programs ... Of the 440,000 enrollees (out of 3.1 million enrolled in adult federal and state funded adult education classes in 1985-86) who left before completing their objectives, thirty-five percent identified specific limiting factors such as health and day-care problems, changed residence, and problems with transportation." (pp. 9-10).

Houle (1964) also found frequently mentioned problems that learners encounter that lead to their dropping out are:

* increased workload
* illness
* greater family responsibilities
* financial problems
* military duty
* conflict in schedule with some necessary activity
* need to travel
* permanent movement out of town
* difficulty of catching up after interruption in the schedule (p. 227).

Poor attendance can be a precursor to dropping out. Smith-Burke (1989) found in her study of adults in New York that learners missed sessions because of health problems, a variety of family-related issues such as child care and legal matters, job conflicts, transportation problems and lack of progress. These reasons for poor attendance ultimately become reasons for dropping out.

For example, if learners begin to fall behind in their lessons or progress, they may become discouraged with their lack of progress and leave the program. Some suggest that providing flexible scheduling, enrolling only those students who will commit themselves to regular attendance, providing one-on-one tutoring to make up missed lessons, provide computer-based instructional materials to allow students to work at their own pace, and developing mandatory homework that students can handle on their own, can address the problem of learner dropout and sporadic attendance due to their inability to keep up with the work load (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). This is especially important since previous research suggests that because of initial low skills, it is difficult for learners to keep pace with instruction (Houle, 1964).

Interestingly, the nature of the program itself, (e.g., its delivery system) may be conducive to high attrition rates. Crandall et al. (1984) identified some structural elements of programs that were related to high dropout rates such as the following:

* programs geared to the 4-7 grade level learner were more likely to have a dropout rate above 30% than other programs

* Programs open only 1-4 days per week had higher dropout rates than programs open 5-6 days per week

Sometimes, finding out the "true" reason learners leave the program is difficult. It may well be, as Bowren (1987) points out, that although learners usually cite reasons related to the job, home, health, and transportation; Could it be that leaving is really related to the perceived or actual rate of learning? Do these programs really accomplish what they purport to do? How much difference is really made in the lives of the participants? (p. 211). Diekhoff (1988) paints a dim picture; "The majority of adult literacy participants do not accomplish meaningful, practically significant reading improvements and leave training without achieving 'functional literacy' however one may choose to define it." (p. 625).

Reasons Learners Stay in Program

Learners who cannot read are usually at a disadvantage in society, thus their problems are greater than being able to read, their problems are economic, political, and social in nature -- not just academic. Trying to address all of the adult illiterates' problems may be asking too much of literacy programs, yet identifying reasons why learners do stay in programs is a first step. Below is a discussion of some successful attempts to address this problem.

Whether a program can keep a learner might depend on the very first impression or visit to the program office. Bock (1980) states that "This is the stage when many under-educated participants drop out ... and it calls for assurance that the first class session will be a positive experience." (p. 127). The first session may just be one of three critical time periods that learners are at risk of dropping out. For instance, some suggest that adults are at risk of leaving after the first week, and again after the three and nine month periods (Patterson & Pulling, 1981), or at the beginning of the year (Darling, 1981). Therefore, focusing attention and services (e.g., counseling, social events, progress reports) to learners during these critical periods could help increase learner participation and reduce attrition.

Emphasis on the importance of the first contact with the learner is also mentioned by Diekhoff and Diekhoff (1984). They note that programs can increase their retention rates by identifying -- and addressing -- certain learner characteristics (e.g., age, reasons for coming for literacy instruction, characteristics of learner's family, employment status, and race) during the intake procedure to identify at-risk adults who may be potential dropouts.

Balmuth (1987) also underscores the importance of the intake procedure by stating that, "It should include a review of the student's educational history, and a discussion of the student's perceptions of the problem, its origins, and any insights the student has into ways that he or she learns best --- all designed to involve the student in an objective appraisal of the problem and thus start the process of dealing with it." (p. 10).

Since illiterate adults also have other problems in addition to reading and writing, counseling can be an important retention factor. As Grabowski (1976) points out while referring to one of the few studies addressing the issue of counseling's impact on the adult learner, "... there is more

progression among counseled groups than the noncounseled groups in the area of educational, occupational, and social categories." (p. 225). Cross (1978) states that low-income groups are more interested in counseling and advisory services than high income groups ... therefore, counseling services should be overrepresented in low-income areas." (p. 40).

One program found counseling to be very important to the adult participants and integrated it into all facets of the program. As a matter of fact, staff found that higher retention rates and reading achievement were attributed to the counseling which was integrated into the program's recruitment, staff training, instruction, and evaluation components (Darling, 1982). Scores increased almost 2 grade levels after 82 hours of instruction. The importance of counseling and its relationship to attendance and achievement is underscored in this program example. For instance, it was found that attendance was related more to achievement than teaching methodology.

Some learners see the opportunity to socialize while at the literacy program and -- as a result -- they keep returning. In fact, adults have noted that socializing before, during, or after class was very enjoyable (Newman, 1980; Darling, 1981; Jones & Petry, 1980). Thus, providing amenities and creating a friendly atmosphere can only enhance a program's chances for assuring that learners feel comfortable and possibly will return.

Family support for the learner's participation has been found to have a positive effect on retention (Smith-Burke, 1987) and progress (Quickel & Wise, 1982). For example, the Smith-Burke notes, "It is almost impossible to conceive of any adult learner wanting to continue without the support and encouragement of the people significant in his or her life." (p. 40). When respondents to Smith-Burke's interview were asked to state the major factors positively affecting their attendance, the majority mentioned family support." (p. 40). This includes friends and employers as well, although as mentioned earlier, many learners tend to hide their reading and writing deficiencies from their employers (Darling, 1981). Quickel and Wise (1982), examined "non-reading" adults and "poor reading" adults and found that "The student makes better progress when his family is supportive." (p. 15).

In addition to addressing affective aspects of the learner, generally, learners need to know that they are succeeding. Wallace (1965) notes "Adult students cannot fail today and succeed tomorrow; for if they fail today, they will not be back tomorrow." (pp. 43-44). Apparently then, learners will persist in literacy programs if the learning activities are useful in meeting learners' objectives (Anderson & Darkenwald, 1979).

Providing learning activities that seem useful to the learner might be tied to the materials used during the instructional sessions. For instance, earlier, a study by Hutchinson was reviewed that noted that adults who received instruction with teacher-made selections based on learners stated interests attended sessions 30% more than the control group receiving instruction from commercially prepared materials and kits. Thus retention and choice of instructional materials and methods may impact learners' decisions to stay in the program.

Providing meaningful and useful instruction may be the bottom line as to whether learners stay or leave. Boraks and Schumacher (1981) found in their study of 14 Adult Beginning Readers (ABRs) that "ABRs who felt that teachers did not consider how they wanted to learn tended to drop out." (p. 14). Darkenwald (1975) found that by teaching non-traditional subjects like consumer education, health education and coping skills, learner dropout rates decreased and attendance increased.

In a later study, Darkenwald (1986) reported similar findings while analyzing effective programs identified by the Joint Dissemination Review Panel. Similar results were noted in a study of California's competency-based (CASAS) program where the authors reported that "Although student retention rates statewide did not change significantly ...one sampled 'high CBAE implementing' agency had a significantly higher student retention rate than did a 'low CBAE implementing' agency that was comparable in size and student population." (CBAE Staff Development Project, 1987, p. 33).

As mentioned earlier in this section, identifying certain adult characteristics can "flag" potential problems and suggest the need to provide interventions to keep the learner in the program. Diekhoff and Diekhoff (1984) examined demographic data and other personal information from 66 adult learners in Texas and found the following five variables to be significantly related to persistence:

1. age
2. GED training
3. illiteracy in the family
4. employment status
5. race

The authors noted that, as age increased, persistence in the program became more likely; adults who stated upon entry into the program that they wanted to pursue subsequent GED training were more likely to persist; if other family members were literate, chances were that the learner would continue on with the program; learners who were employed usually stayed in the program and, Hispanics were more likely to dropout. The authors suggest two reasons for this latter finding: 1) minorities drop out because of the mismatch between them and their middle and upper class White tutors who fail to understand or empathize with the different cultures, and/or 2) Hispanics learned English as a second language and probably found learning to read a more difficult task than did native speakers of English. (p. 41).

Other characteristics of learners who persisted were uncovered by Anderson and Darkenwald (1979). While surveying 9,000 participants in adult education programs to determine why learners choose to participate, how satisfied they were, and reasons for their persistence, the authors noted that the amount of formal schooling completed was the best indicator of persistence followed by age of learner (older learners did not seek more education... this is in contrast to Diekhoff & Diekhoff's previously presented findings). Apparently minorities were more at risk as noted by the following finding: "The researchers also discovered that low socioeconomic status in combination

with being young and Black had a pronounced negative effect on persistence."

Thus, based on these two accounts, Blacks and Hispanics seem to be more prone to dropping out of adult literacy programs. Further study in this area is warranted to uncover the reasons for this situation.

Finally, program staff cannot assume why learners participate in their programs. For instance, research suggests that learner's reasons for participating in literacy programs may not always be tied to finding a job or work-related. Darkenwald and Valentine (1984) noted that the most important outcomes or benefits to learners in ABE programs had little to do with employment. They quote the work of Kent (1973) who found in a national study that two-thirds of the adults surveyed gave self-improvement, not employability, as the chief reason for attending." (p. 11).

By and large, programs need to design programs with the adult learner in mind in order to keep them. This idea can be best summed up by a passage in the U.S. Department of Education unpublished study that states; "Keeping adults coming to class requires designing programs that respond to their characteristics, needs and goals -- whether at work, in the community, or in the family. Adult literacy programs that work, focus on the needs of the students to be served; plan activities that best suit their learning characteristics; and join with other organizations such as social service agencies, health centers, employment agencies, churches, schools, and community centers to help meet the students' needs. The more students find that the literacy program responds to their needs, the more likely they are to come to class and keep coming until their individual goals have been met." (p. 13).

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

Program Management

Program management is a term that encompasses a number of components. It refers to the program's use of human and fiscal resources, their approach to staff training/development, public relations and community involvement, and use of program evaluation. Balmuth (1987) describes the term "administrative structures" of program operations to encompass staff development, retention, attendance, counseling and time." (p. 28). She notes that much of the success or failure of programs is due to these administrative structures.

Mayer (1985) describes management in the following terms:

* staff management
* financial management
* office management
* records management
* reporting

Under staff management come personnel practices that include clear expectations for both paid and volunteer staff, use of volunteers, prevention of burnout by rewarding personnel, internal coordination for planning and coordinating activities, and engendering feelings of ownership through continual communication among staff.

Financial management includes sound fiscal management of expenditures, maintenance of a diversified financial support system, and fundraising from sources consistent with the program's mission statement.

Office management begins with maintaining an identifiable and accessible location and insuring that it is adequately equipped.

Records management entails determination of record keeping needs, developing a system for maintaining and updating learner and instructor records, and compiling summary data that reveals the program's level of activity and performance.

Finally, with regards to reporting, the authors recommend that programs submit reports in timely fashion and be accountable to its board, participants, funding sources and the community at-large.

Crandall et al. (1984) point out that program directors -- while in their roles as managers -- build strong collaborative staff teams and solve problems that erode staff and learner morale. (p. 303). This sentiment has also been echoed by the authors of the U.S. Department of Education's study on adult literacy programs that work. They recommend that programs "Build and nurture a 'team spirit' among the program staff and students by emphasizing a sense of mission in an adult literacy program." (p. 56).

In sum, program management is the structure or blueprint for subsequent program operations. It usually entails all of the facets of the program's being, from the methods programs use to recruit learners and tutors, to

methods of evaluating the program, fundraising and networking with other community agencies. In the next section, a discussion of how programs use different resources both human and fiscal will be reviewed.

What Kinds of Fiscal and Human Resources do Programs Have?

Human Resources. In terms of human resources, programs normally have a coordinator or director, and depending on program size, a support staff of assistants and coordinators to run the program's daily operations. Generally speaking, library-based and community-based organizations use volunteers to teach and perform other program tasks while literacy programs that operate out of school districts or community colleges have more resources from which to draw than smaller adult literacy programs, and usually pay their instructors (who are usually credentialed) and staff (who many times are former instructors).

The presence of paid staff can have an effect on program recruitment and perhaps other areas of management. Harris (1984) notes the importance of paid staff by reporting in South Carolina those organizations that had a full-time or part-time paid professional coordinator were the ones that attracted and retained the largest number of students registered and largest number of available tutors.

Yet, as noted above, not all programs (even ABE and community college) have substantial budgets to pay coordinators to train, counsel, or recruit and therefore must rely primarily on volunteers to perform these functions. For instance Chisman (1989) notes that "There are practically no full-time adult basic skills teachers in the United States, for the simple reasons that very few public or private programs operate full time, pay a competitive wage, or provide benefits. Most teachers are part-time professionals or volunteers. Their primary training and career paths are outside this field." (p. 8).

The SRA study in California found that in their program sample of ABE, community colleges, library and community-based programs, not surprisingly community colleges and adult school programs relied upon paid professional staff teaching primarily in a classroom setting whereas many public library literacy programs and community-based programs use trained volunteer tutors to provide instruction to adults on a one-to-one basis.

In addition to program personnel, many programs have an advisory board or steering committee to approve budgets, activities and mission statements. Harris (1984) suggests that, "The first thing is to set up a strong management team...starting with support from the state office, and then identify and organize a local council ... this larger group should identify and hire a local coordinator to take over site management." (p. 13).

Other Human Support Services. In addition to teachers, programs use (or can use) the services of other specialists on an ongoing basis. However, many programs do not provide these services because they cannot afford them or they adjust other areas of services to provide these additional ones. Below are mentioned the support services that commonly are referred to that demand that a qualified person perform. This qualified person can donate their time --

and this happens from time to time -- yet in many cases these persons are needed on an ongoing basis, and as such are usually paid. Because they do effect the cost of operating the program (if the program chooses to use such services), they are mentioned here.

Counseling. Much of the research advocates that counseling be a regular part of the literacy program. The presence of counseling has shown a positive relationship to learner progress (Darling, 1982; Grabowski, 1976). Yet many adult literacy programs operating on shoestring budgets cannot pay for a qualified counselor. Some suggest that counseling be integrated into the teaching methods (thus having teachers do counseling) to provide for both cognitive and affective development of the learner (U.S. Department of Education, 1988). Whether programs pay for a counselor, or have teachers perform this activity, counseling is a program component that can effect costs.

Reading Specialists/Diagnostician. Some programs feel the need for a diagnostician to perform the assessment exercises. Many feel that tutors or teachers are not qualified to administer tests nor do they have the time to perform these tasks. Interpreting and using results of diagnostic tests is also an important function of instruction, if tests are to be meaningful. Paying a diagnostician to perform the assessment activities can relieve the tutors and teachers of this function freeing them to teach, however, information from the tests can be useful to the teaching situation. Depending on what decision programs make about assessment, this particular component can add to the costs of the program.

Training. Some feel that although volunteers should be praised for their efforts and contribution of their free time to help in the literacy effort, they are not as effective as a trained certificated teaching staff, that more than a "degree of caring" is necessary to teach adults. Even certified teachers may need to be re-trained to teach adults. As Bowren states, "Simply training a teacher to teach 'reading' may not be enough. We need to identify a specific set of competencies which are required to teach an adult to read ... few institutions even attempt to train teachers differently for adult reading instruction." (p. 211).

Yet others feel that trained volunteers can be used to teach adults and they constitute a very important factor in adult literacy programs (Delker, 1984; Waite, 1984). The issue centers around qualifications and appropriate training. Greenleigh Associates reported that unsuccessful programs in their study showed "an unrealistically small amount of time was set aside ... for staff training. It was distressing to observe teachers struggling with classes because they were not prepared to teach the skills needed by the class when, in fact, these same teachers, who were endowed with intelligence, sensitivity, and classroom presence, could become fine instructors if they were properly trained." (in Balmuth, p. 37).

However, in most cases, volunteers do receive some training on program selected materials and teaching methods. Wurzbacher and Yeannakis (1986), for instance, found that tutors in the California Literacy Campaign received an average of 9.5 hours of initial tutoring training. In either case, training

is a program component that needs to be ongoing -- that is -- initial training for beginning tutors or teachers -- then continual staff development at various times during the instructional cycle. In some cases, trainers are paid on an as-needed basis by programs. Also, training is donated by colleges or "parent organizations or included in a grant." Sometimes programs take advantage of training opportunities provided at adult literacy conferences or seminars. Again, as with the above-mentioned components, hiring one to train on an ongoing basis has implications for program costs.

Fiscal Resources

As Mayer (1985) maintains, programs should have diverse funding sources to protect against cutbacks from any particular sector. Possible sources include private foundations, corporations, federal, state and local governments; federal giving programs such as United Way, and locally devised sources (e.g., charging for materials, training, etc.). This suggestion is particularly important since a diverse funding base will allow programs to branch into other areas that certain funding sources will not allow.

Harris (1984) suggests that programs start by identifying possible funding sources and professional resources. She points out that "free professional help is just as good as having money and can come off the top of the operations cost." Agreeing with Mayer, she also suggests that "We need to shift to a mix, or partnership, of public and private funding. The diverse funding base gives you more freedom to operate." (p. 5).

As Crandall et al. (1984) point out, program directors spend a great deal of time and energy attempting to secure funding for the survival of their programs. Given the deep cuts in federal and state expenditures in all human service areas, many budgets are being drastically reduced, and this in turn, has taken a serious bite out of services provided." (p. 304).

What are Costs of Maintaining Programs? What are The Per-Student Hour Costs? What are The Per-Teacher Hour Costs?

Crandall et al. (1984) note in their survey of 168 literacy programs that group instruction is more cost effective [than one-on-one tutoring] and enables the organization to offer instruction to more students.

Since different programs provide different types of services (e.g., counseling, referrals) to varying degrees accruing varying costs, it is difficult to put a price tag on typical literacy services. For instance, space is not necessarily a problem for adult schools and community colleges yet CBOs must rent adequate space. Other programs who are reaching out to the "hardest-to-reach" might find it necessary to have a number of locations in the community to attract learners. The cost of renting property, for example, varies depending on the neighborhood. On the other hand, program space can be donated thus saving CBOs substantial costs. The point is, estimating costs for maintaining programs is difficult. Yet in this section, a discussion of the different program components will be reviewed.

The costs of maintaining the program are associated with the type of program and the services the program provides (e.g., child support,

counseling, training, etc.). For instance, adult schools and community colleges usually have budgets approved by boards of education or boards of trustees which total into the millions of dollars to pay for teachers, support services, materials, etc., whereas CBOs depend on grants from foundations or corporations.

Yet even the adult basic education programs are feeling the budget crunch. Crandall et al. (1984) note that "The federal Adult Basic Education program appropriations hover around $100 million annually and serve between two and three million adult learners per year." (p. 305). This number of adults served is well below the 23 million (or 60 million depending on whose figures are used) classified "functionally illiterate." Crandall cites the situation in California where the state served 600,000 undereducated adults in 1983 and estimates that at this level at least 1,000 undereducated adults have to be turned away every week." (p. 305).

Chisman (1989) reports that "The vast majority of the twenty million plus are not reached by any program that would help them in any way. At most, 3-4 million people are served each year, and an average expenditure per learner is less chan $200. Compare that with an average expenditure of more than $4,000 per year for every public school child in the United States." (p. 5).

On the other hand, smaller programs that are community or library-based operate on somewhat smaller budgets. It has been estimated that "... most CBOs operate on budgets that range between $15,000 and $200,000 per year, usually at the lower end. The financial constraints they work under would be daunting to any conventional enterprise." (BCEL, 1986).

Lane et al. (1984) noted in her evaluation of California's library-based literacy programs that a per-pupil expenditure of $200.00 ".. was too low a per capita figure for a start up year ... [and] There are some indications that $500.00 to $750.00 per-student tutored would be more appropriate." (p. 47).

Chall et al. (1987) report that the approximately $100 million per year of federal funding devoted to literacy programs for adults, when divided among the states, allows an average of only about $160 per student per year. The authors add, "If the criterion of literacy includes those who seek the advanced, high-level skill in reading required of high-tech positions, then the allotment would be approximately 72 cents per student. Even programs receiving federal funds find themselves in need of additional fiscal resources. The authors in the above-mentioned study reported on an exceptionally resourceful program that was able to draw enough financial resources to spend $2,500 per student (p. 193).

Thus, the costs of maintaining programs are increasing. For most programs, to stay even, they need more fiscal resources. As Crandall reports, "Raising funds and monitoring budgets has become the major challenge for the manager of a literacy program, and this is equally true regardless if the programs are ABE, volunteer, military, corrections or employment and training." (p. 307).

In order for programs to continue under current funding levels, many find it necessary to eliminate services. As Crandall et al. note, "This amounts to not only a reduction of literacy services, but to a loss of diversity of literacy services." (p. 308). For instance most agree that training is an important component of literacy programs. Yet as Chisman (1989) observes, "Operating with limited budgets, the managers of basic skills programs correctly perceive that every dollar spent on teacher training is a dollar unavailable for providing services. Because they are usually held accountable for the number of hours of instruction provided, or some other crude measure of service, they rarely invest their dollars in teacher training, despite the fact that most teachers say they very much need and want more help." (p. 8).

What are The Leadership Qualities of Those Who Manage The Programs?

An extensive review of leadership qualities in effective adult literacy programs was conducted by Crandall et al. (1984). They noted that program directors have two leadership qualities: 1) they possess a clear program philosophy and 2) they impart that philosophy to others. They impart that philosophy by networking, politicking and acting as a public relations agent for the program. The authors report that program directors who appear to possess clear program philosophies are strikingly more charismatic that those who do not. (p. 301). Also, programs benefit from the leaders networking activities by keeping track of new funding opportunities, knowing of new instructional strategies, and keeping track of new collaborative possibilities.

The program leaders' role in networking was detailed in a report for the Urban Literacy Network (Williams, 1988). The author provides a list of leadership competencies of directors of cooperative urban literacy efforts (although these attributes are clearly significant to leaders of literacy programs not actively engaged in cooperative efforts). They include the following:

* creativity, perspective, confidence, sense of humor
* system analysis; understanding the complex array of factors that comprise the broad literacy, human service, political, and economic context
* needs assessment and planning
* design appropriate structures and organizational arrangements
* forging effective relationships with diverse individuals and groups
* translating information across diverse contexts and perspectives
* facilitating meetings with high stakes agendas and complex dynamics
* identifying, developing, and implementing core functions
* resource development
* conflict resolution and consensus building
* developing and maintaining a clear vision
* creating an identity; public relations
* evaluating, monitoring, and administering grants

The author notes that "The sensitivity and competence of leaders of cooperative efforts is, not surprisingly, a major influencing success and long term viability." (p. 9).

Networking is also an important quality for leaders in rural programs as well . Hone (1984) points out that the programs in her study represented many different cooperative arrangements. She notes that "...in rural areas where educational resources may be limited to begin with, new programs need to capitalize on all the existing resources they can. Traditional rivalries or "turf" issues have to be overcome to form a partnership with a common goal: serving the rural student." (p. 15).

In a study of adult literacy programs implementing the California State's Competency-Based Adult Education (CBAE) program, an alternative view of leadership roles was identified. In essence, to facilitate the implementation of the CBAE program, a person or "key communicator" (who was not necessarily the program director) emerged to perform important tasks. The authors note that "The person in this role typically had to handle critical responsibilities as a leader in planning, coordinating, communicating and generally holding together the implementation process in a coherent way." (p. 44).

The need for the program director/leader to have a clear program philosophy has moved some to recommend the implementation of training models for program administrators and staff developers to address these and other issues (Johnson, 1985). For instance, the author recommends that flexible and comprehensive training models should be developed for administrators and staff developers that provide a planning framework and procedures that administrators can use to acquire background information on the state-of-the-art in literacy education, articulate a program philosophy, assess needs and set goals, identify instructional methods and resources, determine formative and outcome evaluation measures and form community partnerships." (p. 17). All of these areas, as this section has shown, are important aspects of the program leader's role.

Leaders also have two managerial skills according to Crandall et al. (1984): 1) decision making, and 2) problem solving. The problems and decisions that they make concern budgets, fundraising, finding program space and proposal writing. The program director as program leader combines visionary and political prowess with managerial skills such as problem solver and decision maker.

The authors further note that program directors need to adjust to the realities of changing funding patterns. For instance, they note that "Program directors who used to see themselves primarily as administrators have to be prepared to become grant writers, developers and public relations specialists." (p. 309). They go on to say that "programs who are managed by people who can handle this professional conflict, appear to have a distinct competitive advantage in the quest for private funds." (p. 309).

While noting effective characteristics of program directors during their site visits, Crandall et al. (1984) state that, "Those characteristics include both general attitudes toward staff and also concrete actions in implementing a staff development plan. Thus directors demonstrate their competence through creating a climate for staff growth and through a definite organized structure for staff training." (p. 318).

In a study conducted by the U.S. Department of Education (1988), the roles of the program leader were outlined to include the following characteristics:

* work with staff and students to develop the program philosophy

* communicate the program philosophy and mission clearly to staff, students, and the outside world

* make sure that staff and students understand the reasons for doing what the program leader expects of them

* consult with staff and student representatives in making decisions and solving problems that affect them

* provide orientation and regular staff development activities for all staff, paid and volunteer.

In sum, the report states that "It is up to the program director or leader to build the staff into a cohesive team --- a team that also includes the students -- dedicated to accomplishing the mission of the program." (p. 56).

The program leader should also take an active role in program evaluation as well (Crandall et al., 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1988). Willing (1989), while noting that program evaluation is important to program planning, mentions that "There must be a strong leader in the evaluation process. This leader must promote the evaluation process as a strategy for program improvement and must create internal support from the staff for the process to be successful." (p. 5).

The U.S. Department of Education (1988) report suggests that managers can use data from program evaluation to improve staff performance, chart progress and determine the extent to which students are learning, and to make sure that the program is fulfilling its mission. Unfortunately, most program directors are untrained in the techniques of design and measurement and do not have access to this kind of expertise (Johnson, 1985). Thus, the training model mentioned earlier in this section, might serve this author's concerns.

The role of the program leader has been detailed in this section. In essence, the leader wears many hats, and is responsible for maintaining the well-being of the program. The commitment of the staff to work towards achieving program goals is based on the leader modelling appropriate behavior

and being flexible to meet the changing needs of the staff and community.

The leaders ability to obtain resources during hard times, keep staff moral up by continual positive reinforcement, and maintain the program's posture in the community as a viable resource are just part of the responsibilities associated with the job. No wonder that exemplary programs have exemplary program leaders (directors) that drive the program and staff in a positive direction.

INTERNATIONAL LITERACY EFFORTS

International Literacy Efforts

Introduction

In order to present the State Department of Education (SDE) a broader perspective of effective literacy practices, this section will discuss international efforts to reduce illiteracy. The section will include the following four sections:

1. approaches to eliminating illiteracy
2. vignettes of certain countries' attempts to reduce illiteracy
3. womens' role in literacy campaigns
4. discussion of findings relative to SDE's goals

Three Current Literacy Approaches

While all approaches to literacy share the same long-term goal, mainly to teach illiterates to read and write, there are differences in how and what literacy is taught. Currently, there are three approaches that characterize the teaching of literacy around the world: the Laubach phonics-based method, the Freire method (Cultural Circles), and the Language Experience approaches (Read & MacKay, 1984).

The Laubach approach. The Laubach approach gained its reputation in the Third World. This method has been imported almost unchanged to Canada despite the gulf between the literacy goals of a developing country and industrialized nations (Read & Mackay, 1984). While developing countries are trying to eradicate complete illiteracy, the highly industrialized nations seek functional literacy for all. The Laubach method uses a each-one-teach-one-way and has been widely used in adult literacy programs in many countries. Missionaries have long used this method with the primary goal of teaching adults to read religious materials and to acquaint them with spiritual aspects. Laubach has transcribed 274 (previously unwritten) spoken languages into simple, phonetically regular forms where each letter of the alphabet has only one way of being pronounced.

The success of the Laubach method is due largely to its use of content materials relevant to the context of the Third World. Literacy goals sought are generally low but are achieved rapidly because of language regularity. The learning with equals is continuously reinforced in that those who have achieved a basic level of literacy become the teachers of the new illiterates. Thus, the new literates gain self-respect and confidence and continue to improve their literacy. The Laubach method enables a country to reach large numbers in a relatively short period of time. Laubach forecasts that the entire illiterate population of a country could be reached in only five years if 8 percent were taught in the first year: 9-16-32-64-128 percent (Read & Mackay, 1984).

In Canada, illiterates in the Laubach program are usually tutored on an individual basis by volunteers who have undergone a short (9-12 hour) training course. Learners are thus isolated from each other, making it difficult for

illiterates to compare their experiences and discuss common problems with others in the same situation. The learner is seen as a passive receiver of knowledge given by his or her tutor. Tutors are instructed to use a frequently repeated pattern to teach the sounds of the letters. Activity is limited to oral repetition of sounds and isolated fragments of language: it is phonics-based.

The popularity of the Laubach method is due to a large extent on the comprehensive set of materials which give the tutor a sense of confidence and program administrators a sense of organization and program comprehensiveness. With only a few hours of training from the very detailed instructional manuals, the tutor with teaching experience or knowledge of reading theory can go out to teach illiterates. The tutor/illiterate situation is very rigid: the student imitates the tutor and normal conversation is not part of the first stages of the program. However, the method can be supplemented with readers that are more learner-oriented.

Despite the success of the Laubach method, it may not be compatible to the needs of the more industrialized countries which require a higher level of literacy than that sought in the developing countries. Compatibility is also problematic for countries with phonetically irregular languages such as English.

The Language Experience approach. Currently there is a sharp shift in literacy expectations. Emphasis is now placed on pedagogies that stress comprehension and reading for new information rather than mere decoding. An effort is being made to obtain meaningful print. Through the Language Experience approach, the literacy learners build on their existing competencies as they learn to read. Thus, the learning experience is a continuation of what they already know and the materials used provide a whole language experience rather than fragmented and isolated patterns of language.

The Language Experience approach begins with discussion groups in which the new literacy student shares his or her common interests and problems. Upon completion of the discussion, the students attempt to write it as a class account. The teacher records the discussion utilizing a chalkboard or a flip-chart and the teacher and the class together read back the words utilized by the students. This relevant material becomes the basis for teaching comprehension strategies, word-attack skills and decoding skills necessary for understanding unfamiliar material. The texts are prepared from the students own vocabulary, ideas, grammar and expressions. This requires trained teachers that are also competent in materials development. Thus, little published material is needed; however, as they progress, exploration of other reading material is valuable.

The Language Experience approach can be utilized in any type of setting, including the ideas in the teaching materials that give the students a sense that the purpose of writing is to communicate ideas. It gives them a sense that their needs, interests, opinions and attitudes are important to the learning process.

Paulo Freire's Education for Social Action approach. Paulo Freire believes that literacy is meaningless without the illiterates' awareness of their position in society and that literacy education can provide the means for examining that role. The Freire method takes the literacy learners beyond an awakening of their critical consciousness and into the world of action to transform their situation.

Like the Language Experience approach, illiterates in the Freire method participate in initial group discussions, which he calls culture circles. He uses these circles to discuss the problems of illiteracy as well as other problems that equally affect their lives, such as poverty, nationalism, democracy and development. The method attempts to raise their consciousness while eliminating their illiteracy. In the Freire method, the literacy students are subjects rather than objects of learning. The students become critical thinkers about their reality instead of simply being fed (banking) a body of information which they did not possess or which was not necessarily part of their lives (Freire, 1974). As with the Language Experience approach, Freire's method builds on the knowledge which the illiterates already possess.

Freire's method, popularly known in Latin American countries as concientizacion, consists of three stages: listening, dialogue and action. Community/literacy workers observe and talk with the illiterates in their own environment to find out the topics in which they are interested. These then become the basis and content of the literacy courses. The teacher is a participant-observer who focuses on themes relevant to the learners.

In stage two, Freire used ten illustrations of situations to discuss man's participation in the transformation of his reality. The first depicts a man working in the fields, a house and a well. Discussion of this picture is used to demonstrate the differentiation between nature and culture and how man transforms nature through work for his own ends. Participants are asked who built the well and why, and how was it built. From this discussion, they begin to appreciate their role in culture. The discussions proceed from situation to situation until they arrive at the last picture which depicts a culture circle in action (Freire, 1974). By synthesizing the nine previous discussions in the culture circle illustration, they come to recognize that they have been the participants and that they have the ability to think out complex thoughts.

Freire applied the same method to the teaching of literacy. Generative words became the basis of reading instruction. He used words that were relevant to their reality such as favela (slum), trabalho (work), salario (wages), chuva (rain), terra (land), alimentacao (food), riquesa (wealth), etc. The words were broken down into families of syllables. Aside from Cariocan pronunciation used in the Rio de Janeiro area, Portuguese has a regular phonic correspondence between letters and sounds, though not to the extent of Spanish. Read & Mackay (1984) report that learning to read was known to have taken as little as 30 hours of instruction with the Freire method.

In the last action stage, literacy learners use their culture circle to resolve immediate problems affecting them, such as the inability for a student

to attend because of a lack of child care. Thus, the approach lends itself to U.S community-based programs which, in addition to teaching how to read, can help the students resolve personal or group problems, be they related to immigration, housing, employment, health care, etc. The learning materials would be based on the content, themes, topics and vocabulary which learners contributed. As in the Language Experience approach, the Freire method requires teachers who can understand the students' outside world and who can develop course materials based on the students' input.

In papers presented at the International Literacy Seminar (Toronto Canada, 1987) it was noted that community-based literacy programs were the most often cited using Freire's problem-posing approach, and were sponsored and supported by voluntary and non-government organizations. For many literacy workers, especially those at the community level, literacy work is political by nature since literacy is one of the skills that helps people become more aware of their rights and how to organize to exercise them. The emphasis on the learner-centered approach increasingly acknowledges and respects the experiences and life skills of illiterate adults.

Literacy Programs in Latin America

The Cuban experience. One of the most noteworthy literacy programs mentioned around the world was Cuba's in 1961 (Lorenzetto & Neijs, 1986, Kozol, 1978). With a population of over 10 million and few resources other than commitment, the Cubans have achieved a rate of literacy few countries can match. The literacy campaign was seen as an integral part of the development of Cuba and thus the entire island nation committed itself to the goal of completely eradicating illiteracy. From January 1 to December 22, 1961, 707,212 persons out of 979,207 illiterates were taught.

Publicity was the key element in the Cuban campaign. Media was not used for instruction but it carried the message that every Cuban should become literate for the good of Cuba (Lorenzetto and Neijs, 1986).

The volunteers used to teach literacy to masses were known as **alfabetizadores**. The 233,680 volunteers were mostly students, many of whom were middle class students from Havana. They were trained in regional camps, armed with a primer and sent out to the farthest reaches of the island. Each **alfabetizador** was allotted two illiterate peasants with whom they lived a shared life during the period of teaching. While helping on an individual basis, the volunteers were also very aware of working for the collective benefit of the country.

Decentralization was a key point: each province had a central organization and at the local level the literacy unit consisted of 50 illiterates under the guidance of 25 alfabetizadores. The literacy teachers were guided by 34,720 professional teachers. One professional teacher and a political advisor were under the direction of the chief of the unit.

The success of the literacy program in Cuba was attributable to several factors.

1. The alfabetizadores worked within an intensively limited time frame.
2. Teaching literacy was the main occupation of the volunteers for the duration of the campaign.
3. The message that the volunteers brought concerned land reform, improved food distribution, better health care and education. The message was powerful given the primers' ideological bias and the militant training given to the volunteers.
4. The level of literacy aimed at was fairly low and was achievable within the time allocated: the 1961 goal was not functional literacy but rather a first-grade level of reading.
5. The written form of the Spanish language is relatively easy to master once the alphabet has been learned since there is one-to-one correspondence between each letter and the sound (Goyen, 1989).

But perhaps more important was the link between the revolutionary message brought by the volunteers and the fundamental socioeconomic changes that were taking place at the same time. The distribution of land, food and the provision of health care accompanied the literacy program (Kozol, 1978). Upon completion of the literacy campaign, each new literate was able to write a simple letter to Castro to inform him that illiteracy had been eradicated in one more corner of Cuba.

A UNESCO mission which observed the Cuban campaign outlined five factors that worked in its favor and which would also enhance literacy programs in other countries (Conseil International pour I'Education des Adultes, 1983):

1. National involvement and the existence of a commitment from the central government is required with clear and detailed objectives.
2. The active participation of the people as a whole is crucial: the masses mobilized behind the thrust for literacy; regions of the country competed with each other to be the first to eradicate illiteracy.
3. Coordination and good communication between the program's central agency and regional organizations are very important. Successful programs required flexibility to allow for local needs to be met.
4. Widespread support for the program and acknowledgement of its role in the further development of the society is essential.
5. Even though there exists an international commitment toward a right to literacy, it has not achieved the status of a right in most advanced western countries. In these countries, literacy is seen as an individual choice or deficit rather than a right denied. If literacy is accorded the status of a right and action is taken to facilitate this right, then literacy is achievable.

Building a national movement: The Caribbean experience. The Cuban Literacy Campaign demonstrates the capacity of an underdeveloped country to act decisively within a remarkably short period of time to correct a historical problem using the latent potential of its own people. Jamaica and Grenada are unique because they represent similar applications of governmental

commitment to solving developmental problems with the full participation of the people. In both of these countries, the eradication of illiteracy was not an isolated educational effort: it was the first step in what was to have been an on-going process that sought to establish education as a permanent right. The struggle against illiteracy was considered to be an integral part of a broader struggle against social inequalities.

To conduct literacy work in the context of a process of social transformation poses also the challenge of method. To attempt to make the real life affairs and problems of the adult learner the focus of education is to be faced with the task of understanding, questioning, analyzing and reformulating that experience. In the experience of both Jamaica and Grenada, the eradication of illiteracy was one of the initiatives around which a significant national consensus was achieved. This consensus further provided the stimulus for more meaningful participation on other related developmental tasks. In the Grenada of 1980, it was the work of the literacy campaign more than any other single endeavor that laid the democratic basis for the emergence of the mass organizations of women, youth and farmers.

The Shuar literacy program. In 1985 UNESCO conducted case studies of basic education and literacy in rural populations in Cuba, Costa Rica, Ecuador and Nicaragua. Among these was the Shuar literacy program in the Ecuadorian Amazon Region. Until the 1950s, the Shuar people had an oral culture without either an alphabet or writing. In 1968 the Shuar Federation Radio started to broadcast programs using a system of immediate translation from the Shuar language into Spanish and vice versa.

The purpose of the radio program was to help form the Shuar as Ecuadorian citizens while strengthening their culture through education, information, news and music programming. In 1972, the bicultural radio system was serving 99 Shuar centers, each of which consisted of from 20-25 families, reaching the most isolated Shuar groups.

Shuar Federation Radio used a tele-teacher (the transmitter) and a tele-assistant (receiver) at the family centers who served as mediators for the transmitted message. The contents of the educational materials for adults and children were taken from the official texts of the Ministry of Education, translated into Shuar. Local subjects included social science, domestic studies and aesthetics.

The Nicaraguan literacy program. Nicaragua maintained an illiteracy rate of about 53 percent until 1979. The national literacy campaign conducted between 1979 to 1986 was based on the work of Paulo Freire and the Cuban experience and was adapted to meet the particular conditions and needs of the country. The contents of the literacy materials were linked to the program of national reconstruction, to the history of Nicaragua, and to important problems like housing and political life in the country. The teaching staff consisted of many volunteers, some of them former literacy students themselves. Literacy teacher training programs were continuously conducted. The rate of illiteracy was reduced to 12.9 percent (from 54.4 percent in 1979): of the 406,124 new literates, 331,869 came from rural areas.

The Costa Rican literacy program. In 1973, the Costa Rican Institute of Radio Teaching was created to offer assistance to marginalized adults, especially those who lived in isolated regions of the country. The teacher took the educational message to the homes of the illiterate and they taught literacy and basic education in the native Bribri language. They provided the students with materials which covered the culture and experiences of the target population. This program was so successful that it cut the national illiteracy rate to 7 percent. It also helped expand general education.

Literacy Programs in Industrialized Nations

Literacy programs in the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom campaign for literacy encouraged a very eclectic approach to learning, insisting that the needs of the learner be foremost. The program used authentic materials, such as newspapers, and instructors were allowed to creatively adapt them to their learners and their teaching. Tutors had very little training but were taught how to individualize the radio literacy program. Student needs and interests were utilized as a starting point. The materials were published by the program's central organization.

The program stressed group learning to avoid reinforcing the shame illiterates suffer in one-to-one teaching. In Working With the Word For the Undocumented, Jane Mace (1979) stated that group learning permitted the students to help each other by sharing common experiences related to their illiteracy. The students came to realize that they were not alone; by admitting illiteracy to a group of peers, they could begin to work out the feelings of guilt and shame.

Illiterates are willing to learn to read once the negative stigma is reduced or eliminated through the group process described by Mace. Similarly, TV Ontario developed a protocol **What's Moral with Meaning** where the illiterates themselves were used in videos, rather than professional actors, to avoid focusing on the aspect of shame. Illiterates willing to appear and to be filmed during literacy learning sessions are likely to encourage other illiterates to seek literacy training and thus remove some of the stigma.

Encouraging student writing has become an important part of many literacy programs in England. The writing groups have led to the creation of a working-class literature and a history linked to oral history groups. While documenting the history of the formerly silent (illiterate) population, student writing provides interesting materials for use in literacy activities and helps to improve the self-image of the writer. Some community literacy groups include writers to facilitate the publication.

Library literacy programs in Australia. One of the successful activities in Australia is the coordination of local literacy programs by the librarians (Modra, 1981). This involves administration of tutor-training, using the library as a referral center for potential students, matching students with a tutor, providing materials for learning and promotion of literacy programs.

The Bankstown Municipal Library in Sydney focuses on providing audio-visual as well as print materials for tutors and students. Literacy librarians on the staff work with children as well as adults and there are close links with the Home Tutor Scheme for migrant education. A unique feature of the Bankstown program is that all library staff have been introduced to literacy through inservice training programs. Thus, they are sensitive to the needs of literacy students and their tutors who use the library for borrowing books and who also receive assistance and guided tours.

The Dandenong Public Library in Melbourne coordinates literacy students and tutors and provides their meeting room for literacy activities. The librarian chairs this project and allocates half of her work time to literacy activities. These library literacy programs utilize language experience-based approaches as well as other techniques, such as phonics, where appropriate.

The practice of literacy in the Netherlands. The structure of literacy work is based on organizations at the provincial level. Most population centers and villages have literacy projects which often work with other adult basic education programs (Bohnenn, Ella, 1987). The provincial staff helps to organize the local project, puts on courses and introduces new ideas and materials. The support institute is at the national level -- The Netherlands Study and Development Centre for Adult Education. Its main task is to improve the expertise of literacy teachers and to develop ideas and materials.

In recent years, it has hired a team of literacy workers to develop new ideas and materials in cooperation with the tutors. The rationale for this cooperative effort is based on the belief that tutors develop their own expertise in program development, that they profit from what has been learned from practice, and that they immediately test and evaluate new ideas in practice.

Influenced by the ideas of Freire, Freinet and literacy work in England, they developed a language experience approach, an emancipatory practice in which learning from one's experience goes hand-in-hand with learning to read and write. The group is used as a basis for teaching literacy given its success in England. In England it was found that learning along with others who have the same problems enhances their discovery that illiteracy is not the result of personal failure, thus strengthening self-confidence. The group situation allows students to learn from each other, making them less dependent on the teacher. Groups consist of a maximum of eight students and two tutors.

The central learning focus is related to a theme chosen by the students in which they practice reading and writing. In all cases, the starting point is the learner's situation, experiences and language ability. For example, with a theme like health, they learn how to fill in a form for admittance to a hospital, to write a letter to the insurance company, to describe experiences with doctors. Each story is read by the others and discussed together. Part of each session is spent on specific literacy problems and the practice of skills.

No one specific type of educational material is used in their literacy work. Everyone makes use of existing material, such as order forms,

Learning in groups is favored because people become bonded as a group through shared experiences and concerns, feel more relaxed, and respond to the stimulus of working and learning together. The Ontario Federation of Labour expanded its educational work with a province-wide project of literacy during 1988. The project is directed to a broad range of workers, from functional illiterates to those with literacy and numeracy skills below the level of the secondary school diploma. While the focus is on literacy, the approach is that of preparing workers for adult education and skills development.

The project is identified as Basic Education for Skills Training (BEST) rather than a literacy program. Participants are trainees, not students; meetings are training sessions, not classes; teachers are called facilitators. Each session is two hours long held before work and meets twice a week for 22 weeks; the employer pays for one hour, the other is the employee's own time. Each session is headed by a specially trained facilitator, a volunteer union educator chosen by the participating union affiliate, who receives 150 hours of training. The province is divided into eight regions, each with a coordinator who works with unions and labor councils in a region. During the first year (1988-89), each coordinator was expected to establish 16 literacy programs (eight each term).

The approach of popular literacy groups in Quebec. In 1981, the Regroupement was organized from ten community groups involved in literacy in large city neighborhoods in various regions and with different ethnic communities. Currently, over 30 community groups are members of the Regroupement. These groups are very different, each has its own identity in keeping with the needs and expectations of its participants and they are completely autonomous. A community group may consist of, or form at, a popular education center, a cooperative, a coalition of welfare recipients, etc.

Some groups are involved in literacy only at the local level, while others are at the regional level. Most of the community groups with an ethnic focus teach literacy primarily in the mother tongue, and afterwards teach French as a second language. Most literacy groups were initially motivated by the work of Paulo Freire. This explains the predominance of the awareness approach. However, there is no single educational approach to popular literacy.

Each group and often each workshop (class) develops its own approach according to the needs of the participants. The facilitators generally have to adapt to the needs of the participants. The themes can be varied, depending on the situation of the day's problems or the points of interest such as a sports event, a TV program, entertainment, children, etc.

The training methods and tools are also determining factors. In addition to the use of themes, the technique of discovery is another teaching method. It involves people by directing them to discover, on their own, the relationship between language and its translation. By realizing that they are not mere receivers of information, they discover, through research and comparison, new ways of learning. Other methods encourage the development of self-confidence, critical thought and expressions of creativity. The

following examples were given:

* Some groups produce newsletters designed, written and produced by the participants, which helps de-mystify print. It can be used to disseminate information, to express their views, share an experience, or simply to show their first poem or their first letter. The process helps them communicate with other groups.

* During International Youth Year, one group that works with people ages 18 to 25, produced a videotape on the problems of illiteracy among young people. With the help of the facilitators, these young people decided on the content and carried out all the stages of production from writing the script to filming and editing. Later on, this video was broadcast widely in Quebec; some members of the group presented it and led a discussion with the audience.

* More and more, groups and participants take advantage of September 8-International Literacy Day-by writing to the media to bring up the problem of illiteracy and demand wider access to literacy. Formerly embarrassed to admit being illiterate, now increasingly, illiterates come out in the open by taking part in interviews on radio and TV.

* In one part of Quebec, a meeting of the participants from the groups within the region has become a tradition. They talk about their lives as well as their experiences in the literacy workshops.

* A regional literacy group published an anthology of texts written by participants: fiction, poetry, letters, and other writings.

* In 1985, the Regroupement organized a province-wide Get Together for all the participants of its member groups, planned by a committee composed mostly of group participants. All the groups worked on this large event by taking care of all aspects, from choosing and organizing the workshops to room reservations and scheduling of meals.

Korea's Long March toward a literate nation. On August 15, 1945, when Korea was liberated from 36 years of Japanese colonialism, the illiteracy rate was 78 percent of those age 12 and over -- some eight million people. It was reduced to 26 percent by 1953 and 8.3 percent by 1958. Today, 98 percent of those 12 or older are literate. From 1945 to 1948, adult basic education was really literacy education. The focus was on basic literacy and on a social enlightenment movement that fostered civic education.

In 1948, the informal and community-based campaign of the non-government sector began to be gradually institutionalized by the newly-established independent government into a nation-wide formal literacy education. The new education law of 1949 ensured that everyone was entitled to literacy education as a right and duty. The success of the Korean literacy campaign was largely due to national commitment and the willingness of the Korean people to participate as learners and teachers.

National adult literacy agency (of Ireland). Adult literacy work in the Republic of Ireland. The Dublin Literacy Scheme was established within the Dublin Institute for Adult Education in 1977. It was publicized through the national broadcasting radio service in a series for volunteer tutors called, Helping Adults to Read. The program consisted of a paid organizer and a number of volunteers working on a one-on-one basis in the home of the tutor or learner. In 1987 the government provided funding which was allocated to training of tutors, additional materials, support facilities and part-time organizers. Literacy instruction in small groups has increased significantly and most tutors of small groups receive some kind of payment.

The current trend is for greater involvement of learners in all aspects of literacy work. Material written by students is now the norm. Many literacy centers published newsletters and organized reading evenings for articles, stories and poems written by the students. The National Adult Education Agency helped a group of learners to produce the first annual student publication, thus providing impetus to a number of community-based writing projects.

The national Adult Education Agency was established in 1980. It is a voluntary organization dedicated to promoting and developing adult literacy projects both locally and nationally. It includes individual literacy students, tutors and organizers, local educational authorities, manpower services, government agencies, libraries, trade unions, and training centers for young adults.

The experience of the Soviet Union in the elimination of illiteracy. In 1919 Lenin signed the decree on Elimination of Illiteracy. Schools were assigned the task to make adults literate. To support this work, Down with Illiteracy began to be published in 1920 every two months. It included extracts from fiction: articles on geography, international affairs, farming, and advice on self-education. Successful experiences in teaching literacy were featured and the publication was richly illustrated and difficult words were clearly explained.

Public organizations played a major part in the elimination of illiteracy. For example, trade unions committed themselves to allocation of facilities for literacy teaching called literacy eradication centers; also, they provided schools with heating and lighting and, to some extent, provided schools with teaching aids and paid the salaries of teachers. By 1959, 99.3 percent of Soviet men and 97.7 percent of Soviet females were literate.

One of the educational principles was localization of the teaching material, i.e., the connection of the new knowledge with experiences and ideas of the learners, the use of local lore and other well-known material. The particular features of the mentality of adult learners were taken into account, particularly their proficiency at a conscious perception of subject matter as opposed to a mechanical one. Therefore, teachers tried to explain every spelling rule clearly before they gave a detailed description of the exercises. Drills in writing were based on materials that had meaning for the learners. Teaching was done in heterogeneous groups: the learners helped each other to learn under the guidance of a teacher.

Norwegian for practical use: A multi-media project for adults with reading and writing difficulties. The Norwegian for Practical Use is a multi-media project directed to adults who feel they have difficulties with reading and writing. It was developed by the Norwegian State Institution for Distance Education in cooperation with the Norwegian Broadcasting Corporation, Gyldendal Norwegian Publishers, the Norwegian Council for Primary and Lower Secondary Education, the Norwegian Association of Adult Education Organizations and the National Film Board.

Four 20-minute and nine five-minute TV programs and nine radio programs were broadcast in the evening at prime time during January 1986. A public opinion poll showed that 70 percent of the population had watched at least one program; as many as 84 percent said they now had a better understanding of the problem. After each program, TV viewers were urged to call a given telephone number for more information or simply to talk to someone. The TV programs played a major role in enlisting the people who later took part in the Norwegian for Practical Use.

The printed material, published by Gyldendal Norwegian Publishers, was adapted for the particular segment of the target group that had basic reading and writing skills. The teaching aids included a basic information book and eight booklets on various aspects of reading and writing, all available on audio-cassettes. The typography of the basic book was designed for people with difficulty in reading and featured cartoons and line drawings. It was also designed to give practice in reading, to make it easier for people to live with their problem by giving them support and to give simple instructions on how to write applications and letters. The practical booklets were designed for training in writing. The basic book provided methods for working individually and in groups.

Illiteracy in Spain. The only institution that uses media for teaching literacy is the Centre for Adult Education Through Radio of the Cultural Broadcasting for the Canary region (ECCA). For 23 years it has carried out educational activities through non-commercial radio. ECCA functions as a widespread public center with a special administrative government. It has its own broadcasting station which reaches the seven islands of the Canary region and employs 59 teachers and 300 guidance teachers in 50 centers where students meet each week. The teaching method, called the ECCA system, combines radio lessons, printed material and a weekly meeting with a guidance teacher.

In the province of Las Palmas in Las Canarias, 17 percent of the population is functionally illiterate while the rate is 47 percent in Santa Cruz de Tenerife. This difference is related to the long-term presence in Las Palmas of the ECCA radio program. Out of a population of 1.5 million people in the Canary region, more than 300,000 have enrolled in various programs. In 23 years of operation, ECCA has taught literacy to more than 20,000 adults.

Literacy practice in the Philippines. In 1982, several agencies started to work together in a literacy project for the Hanunoo Mangyan people. The literacy project was initially implemented to take a nonformal approach but it evolved into a formal education project to set up a culturally appropriate

elementary school. However, Mangyan people were not included in its development. Thus, a literacy program was developed by local Mangyan organizations and is supported by the program staff of the Institute for the Development of Educational and Ecological Alternatives (IDEAS). The objective of the project was designed around the Mangyan goal of self-determination, linked to land rights and recognition of the laws and culture of the Mangyan.

When the Mangyan people became aware of the linguistic problem, they saw the need for their own involvement in literacy work. They felt that literacy would give them a position for asserting their land rights, pressuring the government to deliver services and negotiating for better prices for their produce.

The literacy modules are developed through a participatory curriculum development project that involves providing basic research techniques for the Mangyan trainees who are also trained as animateurs. The literacy program takes its cue from the ideas and work of Paulo Freire.

Women and Literacy Efforts

Literacy and empowerment: A definition for literacy. India has the dubious honor of facing the 21st Century with over half of the world's illiterates -- about 500 million. In countries such as India, with an illiteracy rate of over 60 percent, and a rate of over 80 percent for women, literacy programs traditionally have played a major role in educational planning. In 1977-78 the Government of India planned and launched what was intended to be a major national offensive against mass illiteracy. After ten years, the plan to make 100 million adults literate had a limited success in small pockets. But the failures taught some literacy groups what works.

Literacy by itself has no meaning or relevance for the socioeconomically marginalized. Based on the work of ANKUR, a New Delhi literacy project, Ramdas found that it was most beneficial to work with the people in trying to understand their immediate and daily concerns and difficulties: learning together to analyze the problems and understand the root causes, then planning how they could, together, find answers and, above all, take action. Central to the work of ANKUR was building community awareness on such issues as sanitation and health, housing rights, coping with evictions, dealing with police harassment, etc.

Working mainly with women, their literacy centers began to discuss the problems of women in the family and their status in the community. They worked to enable women to build up local support groups, stage demonstrations against dowry, rape and other social issues. Learning about legal rights and about divorce, marriage, inheritance and minimum wages was the real literacy and it certainly gave women a sense of power. When, in the course of the work, there was the occasional demand to learn skills of reading, writing and numeracy, this became part of the program. The role of ANKUR was in the building of people's organizations. Success of the program was measured on observance of a sense of indignation in the people and an awareness of their rights and their dues as well as in collective questioning of authority and a demand for justice.

Literacy and women in South Africa: An alternative approach to learning. Mlambo describes the literacy work done with women's groups in Cape Town under the auspices of the Council for Black Education and Research Trust. Most of the women live in squatter areas which were created as a result of restrictive laws on labor by which men are recruited as migrant workers and separated from their families for long periods of time. Based on Freire's method to liberate people and transform society, the focus of their work is community development and on learning to take responsibility for their own growth and development.

Learners take turns in chairing each meeting. First, learner needs are listed, discussed and prioritized. Through the sharing of experiences, the tutor gains a better idea of the importance of planning the course with participants. Based on real life situations, the literacy work is linked to health education, legal rights, cooperatives, unemployment, etc. They use visual aids to make the lessons more lively, discuss the issue and then analyze the situation. At times, speakers are invited to talk about topics already covered in class. Class meetings are often held in participant's homes because of a lack of facilities.

Learners are shown how literacy is central to economics so that women do not see the lessons as divorced from their everyday lives. When they introduce numeracy, for example, they start with practical aspects based on dressmaking: measuring cloth, working out the amount needed for a dress, reading prices on labels, etc. Throughout the classes, women who are good at certain tasks help those who are having problems. The women are introduced to things which will help them to liberate themselves such as: credit unions, budgeting, and simple bookkeeping to spend money more wisely. Each lesson is evaluated at the conclusion in order to give each participant the experience of developing critical thought and of accepting criticism.

The Federation of Cuban Women. Two-thirds of the world's illiterates are women who cannot take advantage of adult literacy programs because of the need to work (McCall, 1987). Illiteracy among adult females often remains hidden until they have to enter the work force. Then, it becomes a barrier to obtaining positions either in training programs or jobs that enable them to support themselves and their families.

The Federation of Cuban Women was founded in 1960 to make Cuban women aware of the possibilities to increase their cultural, social, economic, and political participation. Organized at the neighborhood level, they were able to locate and convince women of the need to learn to read and write. When Fidel Castro declared Cuba a territory free of illiteracy on December 22, 1961, 55 percent of the 707,212 new literates were women.

Television, radio, and women's and children's magazines were used to popularize reading. Reading circles were organized by the mass literacy organizations. Since one of the problems was that few children's books existed, a book writing contest was initiated to which anyone (professional, amateur and child) could submit an original story. If it was selected for publication, the author received a prestigious award.

The review of international literacy efforts documents similarities and differences when compared to the United States. The program reviewed used either Laubach, language experience approach or the Paulo Freire approach to teaching literacy. In addition, learners formed reading or culture circles to discuss issues relevant to them such as land reform and politics.

The recruitment strategies commonly used made use of the radio to send the message to rural areas about the national literacy campaign. Usually, volunteers (in some cases college students) canvassed the country or selected regions to teach adults mostly in small groups.

Learners' stayed in the programs because the issues they were learning about related to their own needs such as land reform, health issues, education, etc. Very little formal testing occurred yet, in some cases new readers wrote letters to the national officials.

The literacy campaigns received assistance and resources from the central government, yet by-and-large they were decentralized, allowing local regions autonomy to decide on methods and materials. The campaign's successes can be related to a strong commitment by teachers/tutors to overturn high illiteracy rates in their countries.

There are surely lessons that the United States can learn from international literacy efforts. Yet, literacy is defined, in many cases, as being contextual. That is, the context in which the learner lives and operates, will determine the literacy demands made on him/her. Literacy demands also change over time, as can be seen in the United States, where literacy at the turn of the century meant signing one's name or attending so many years of school, to now, where literacy definitions reach reading levels as high as the eighth or twelfth grade. Perhaps Harman (1984) sums this feeling up best with these words of caution, "...one cannot compare United States literacy levels with those of other societies because of the difference in the base of the definitions." (p. 7).

Thus concludes the review of the literature on effective adult literacy program practices. The review demonstrated the variety of approaches to teaching and assessing -- both native English speaking and ESL learners. The review documented the various strategies used by adult literacy programs to recruit and retain adult learners. The importance of program management and the program director's role were highlighted to show how the organization supports and reinforces the effective practices. Finally, a sample of literacy efforts from around the world were reviewed to give a comparison of the characteristics between literacy efforts in the United States and selected countries.

In the next section, the results of the telephone survey will be presented.

PART II:

TELEPHONE SURVEY

II. TELEPHONE SURVEY

Introduction

To supplement the information gathered from the literature on adult literacy, we collected additional data from a carefully selected sample of effective literacy service providers. Data on program practices and impact were obtained through structured telephone interviews with program directors. In addition, site visits were conducted to a small number of noteworthy programs. The information obtained through this process was analyzed and the results provide an empirical basis for drawing conclusions about effective practices.

Procedures

Sampling. The first step was to identify a large pool of potentially effective programs. We consulted with the Department of Education, solicited recommendations from literacy experts and program developers across the state and nation, and reviewed published literature on literacy programs. In addition, we notified over 1,000 literacy service providers in California about the study and asked each to nominate effective programs, including their own. The directory of literacy service providers compiled in 1987 by SRA formed the basis for our mailing list for this communication. (Copies of the letter sent to experts in the field of adult literacy and the letter sent to each service provider are included in the Appendices).

From these efforts, a master list of 140 programs was compiled. These programs reflected the recommendations we received from literacy practitioners and experts in California and across the country. They included programs from all four major sectors of adult literacy service providers identified for this study: Adult Basic Education programs, Community Colleges, Libraries, and Community Based Organizations. Review materials were prepared containing the name and location of each program, the source of the referral, and a brief comment about the strengths of the program. This list was shared with members of the project Advisory Committee, who were asked to make the final selection of sites for further study. The Advisory Committee recommended programs they felt were worthy of inclusion in this study, and, based on these recommendations, ETS staff selected 70 for further examination. It should be noted that the programs in our sample do not represent all possible exemplary adult literacy programs. They are the most effective programs identified by this particular selection procedure.

Developing the Telephone Survey. The purpose of the telephone survey was to gather a broad range of information about the scope, cost and effectiveness of the programs in the sample. This included information about recruitment practices, retention rates, assessment and testing practices, instructional methods, program management, budgets, evaluation, and replicability.

Two documents were developed to facilitate data gathering. The first was a general topic guide for respondents. This document was mailed to the

sampled project directors prior to the actual interview, and it provided them with a summary of the questions to be discussed during the survey. The second was the detailed protocol that was used to guide the interview and record responses. The interview protocol was developed by project staff to solicit information about the many topics of interest in this study. It included both fixed response and open-ended questions to provide comparability as well as flexibility.

The protocols were developed through an iterative process involving staff and practitioners. A draft survey was developed and reviewed by project staff; their comments and suggestions were incorporated into a revised version. This process was repeated two or three times until a final draft was ready. A field test was conducted in which three program directors were interviewed using this version of the instrument. Following the interview their comments on the content and presentation of questions were obtained. Suggestions from the field test were incorporated into the final telephone interview protocol. (Copies of the topic guide and the interview protocol are contained in the appendices).

Conducting the interviews. Interviews were conducted by six ETS staff members. Most of the staff who served as interviewers were involved in the development of the survey and were familiar with its content. New interviewers were briefed on the topics to be addressed, and all were trained on how to administer the survey.

The interviews were designed to last approximately one hour, so it was necessary to schedule each interview in advance. Each respondent was contacted by telephone to arrange a convenient time to respond to our questions. In most cases it was easy to arrange the schedules and respondents were available at the appointed time. In a few instances appointments had to be changed or interviews had to be conducted in two segments to accommodate demands on respondents' times. All interviews were conducted between February 13, 1989 and March 10, 1989. In some cases, respondents sent information or documentation by mail to supplement the data they provided during the interview. All information received in time was incorporated into the data base.

Analyzing the data. Once the interviews were completed, project staff developed categories for coding open-ended responses. This task was not difficult because the range of responses to the open-ended probes was not too broad. After the response categories had been developed, each interview was coded for analysis. To insure that the responses were coded correctly, most coding was done by the same people who conducted the telephone interviews.

After the interview forms were coded, the data were prepared for computer analysis. Frequencies and cross-tabulations were computed for the variables of interest. When appropriate, stem and leaf plots and box plots were generated to clarify the variability of responses. Subgroup analyses were also conducted for the four broad categories of service providers -- adult basic education, community college, library and community based organization.

Results

Comments on procedures. A few clarifications are in order before the results are presented. First, there were a small number of programs that had extreme values on some variables, and these tended to inflate the averages. For example, there were one or two programs that served thousands of learners, while most served only hundreds. Because the mean values do not provide an accurate impression of the "middle" point, we also computed median values. The median is the point that divides the distribution into two subgroups of equal size. In the tables that follow, we will report either the mean (average), the median (midpoint) or both values, depending upon the situation. We will attempt to present the values which provide the most meaningful description of the data.

Second, the telephone survey was designed to be comprehensive and apply to all possible situations. As a result, some questions were not applicable to certain programs. In these situations the responses were coded as missing data. Our general procedure was to ignore missing data without comment in the calculation of means and medians, when the number of missing cases was small. When the number of missing cases exceeded 20% of the sample, this fact was noted at the bottom of the table.

Third, respondents were allowed multiple responses to many questions. For example, programs may have employed more than one arrangement for grouping students. As a result, the percentages of positive responses in some tables may total more than 100%.

Finally, three of the respondents interviewed represented literacy collaborations or networks of programs, and they were not included in the analyses. Their comments are incorporated in the interpretative sections of this report, but are not included in the descriptive analyses.

Nature and size of programs. After excluding the three collaborative projects, we obtained comparable data from 67 adult literacy programs, representing adult basic education (ABE), community colleges (CC), libraries (LIB) and community based organizations (CBO). Table 1 illustrates the number and percent of programs of each type. The largest number of respondents represented community based organizations and adult basic education programs, but there also were substantial numbers of community colleges and libraries in the sample. Two of the programs were classified as "other" because they did not fit into the standard categories. Both were employment related training programs. Because the other category was so small, it was not included in further analyses.

The principal measure of program size is the number of adults receiving instruction. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of adults served at the present time and during a typical month, and these data are reported in Table 2. There were a small number of very large programs that tended to inflate the averages. As a result, we reported both the mean (average) and the median (midpoint) of the distributions. Table 2 also contains the range of values for each type of program.

Table 1

Type of Programs in Sample

TYPE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Adult Basic Education (ABE)	19	28
Community College (CC)	8	12
Community-Based Organization (CBO)	26	39
Library (LIB)	12	18
Other	2	3

Table 2

Number of Learners Served

TYPE	MEAN	MEDIAN	RANGE
	At the Present Time		
ABE	1,952	1,500	90-7,591
CC	1,604	458	136-8,000
CBO	258	180	8- 904
LIB	329	170	40-1,100
	In a Typical Month		
ABE	1,554	725	125-6,375
CC	1,741	450	140-9,000
CBO	221	150	8- 904
LIB	318	160	10-1,100

As one might expect, adult education and community college programs served more students, on the average, than the other two groups. However, there was significant variability in the size of programs in every category. For example, there were large CBO and LIB programs that served more adults than some ABE and CC programs.

Another measure of program size is financial resources. Table 3 displays the mean and median total annual budgets for programs in each of the four sectors. In terms of operating expenditures it is clear that the adult basic education programs were the largest. Community college programs and

community based organizations had somewhat smaller operating budget than ABE programs, and library programs had the smallest operating budgets of the four types. It should be noted that these total budgets reflect just those programs identified in our effective sample. There are many other programs, particularly CBOs and libraries, operating with much smaller budgets than the averages reported here.

Table 3

Total Annual Budget

TYPE	MEAN	MEDIAN	RANGE
ABE	$ 1,266,000	$ 363,000	$ 50,000-6,000,000
CC	$ 456,000	$ 203,000	$ 123,000-1,300,000
CBO	$ 221,000	$ 172,000	$ 34,000- 540,000
LIB	$ 266,000	$ 86,000	$ 45,000-1,800,000

The information on numbers of adults served and total budget show the diversity of programs in the sample. There was great variability within program types as well as between program types. For example, library programs differ as much from one another in size as they do from ABE, CC or CBO programs. Similarly, even though the ABE programs had much in common with one another, they differed dramatically in size. Recognizing such differences is important when trying to draw conclusions about these programs as a group.

Nature of adult learners. Another key element in understanding the manner in which adult literacy programs operate is the nature of the population they serve. Respondents were asked to describe the primary language and the general reading level of the adults they served. Tables 4 and 5 demonstrate substantial differences on both of these variables between the learners who participated in literacy programs of each type. (For both primary language and reading level, the mean and median percentages were quite similar, indicating that the distributions of responses were well balanced and not skewed by extreme scores at either end. As a result only the means are reported.)

Table 4 shows the mean percentage of adult learners in each type of program whose primary language was English, Spanish or Other. It is interesting to note that ABE, CBO and libraries served primarily English speaking adults, while the largest proportion of non-English speaking adults was served by Community Colleges.

Table 4

Primary Language of Adult Learners

	MEAN PERCENTAGE		
TYPE	English	Spanish	Other
ABE	70	28	13
CC	47	42	11
CBO	75	25	7
LIB	79	20	6

Programs also differed in terms of the initial reading level of the adults they served. Table 5 contains the mean percentage of adults grouped into four ranges of reading levels. Though many programs did not use grade levels to classify adult learners, most all were able to estimate the reading ability of adults in these terms. ABE programs served clients with a slightly higher initial reading level than the other three types of programs. This may be due, in part, to the fact that they served primarily English-speaking populations, in contrast to community colleges that served a larger proportion of Spanish-speaking adults. It may also be due to the fact that some of the adults participating in community college programs were taking "non-credit" courses that required a lower reading level. The overwhelming majority of adults served by all four sectors had reading levels at or below the 8th grade.

Table 5

Initial Reading Level

	MEAN PERCENTAGE			
TYPE	0-4th grade	5-8th grade	9-12th grade	12th+ grade
ABE	29	52	16	1
CC	50	39	7	3
CBO	55	29	3	3
LIB	59	24	2	0

Nature of staff. The number and qualifications of instructors are additional factors that may affect program operation. Respondents were asked to describe the teaching staff that worked in each program. Information was obtained about the number of paid and volunteer staff and their teaching experience.

Table 6 shows the mean and median number of paid and volunteer instructors who taught in each program during a typical month. While ABE and CC programs employed larger numbers of teachers than the CBOs or library programs, the community based organizations and libraries used the services of many more volunteers. This impression is confirmed in Table 7 which summarizes the results of a separate question on the percent of instructors who were volunteers. Here the pattern is even clearer: ABE programs had the smallest proportion of volunteer instructors, CC and CBOs were in the middle, and LIB programs were predominately staffed by volunteers.

Table 6

Number of Instructors
in Typical Month

	PAID		VOLUNTEER	
TYPE	MEAN	MEDIAN	MEAN	MEDIAN
ABE	75	55	79	6
CC	38	6	204	75
CBO	5	2	88	14
LIB	3	0	191	115

Table 7

Volunteer Instructors

TYPE	MEAN PERCENTAGE	MEDIAN
ABE	16	0
CC	54	50
CBO	50	65
LIB	90	99

Taken together, these two tables confirm the common impression that ABE and CC programs have larger paid staff, while CBOs and libraries rely on volunteers to a much greater extent. They also make sense in light of the fact that many CBOs and LIBs offer individual tutoring while most community colleges and adult education programs provide instruction in groups. However, it is important to note that there were substantial numbers of volunteers working in ABE and CC programs. These individuals often served as classroom aides and tutors.

Instructional methods and materials

All programs were asked to describe their instructional approach. Respondents answered questions about instructional methods and materials and how instruction is targeted to meet the needs of language minority populations. Their responses will be presented in the following sections.

What instructional approaches are used? Overall, 83% of the programs said they had an instructional method or approach. When asked to elaborate, respondents mentioned a number of different topics including instructional strategies, management approaches, and curricula. Table 8 reports the percent of programs of each type that used various instructional methods. Most programs employed more than one method and gave multiple responses to this question. This accounts for the large values displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

Instructional Approaches
(Percent of Programs)

	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Language Experience	79	88	42	50
Phonics	58	75	42	33
Programmed Instruction	26	0	8	8
Computer Aided Instruction	37	25	19	17
Laubach Literacy Action	32	25	46	50
Literacy Volunteers of America	32	38	15	50
Family Literacy	5	13	12	0
Competency Based Education	53	38	12	8
Other	53	50	57	33

(Other includes: Combinations of the above, cooperative learning, ESL, one-on-one, written language, GED, life skills, peer teaching, Bronx Educational Services Model, PALS, Paulo Freire approach, content area focus, Melmed Learning Clinic Program, theme generation, whole language, Michigan Method, etc.)

The language experience approach was the most popular by far. The vast majority of ABE and CC programs included language experience activities, and these methods were as popular as any other among CBO and LIB programs. Phonics also was used extensively by all type of programs. The greatest difference between program types occurred in the use of competency-based education. Half the ABE programs reported that they used this approach compared to approximately 10% of the CBO and LIB programs. California ABE programs receiving federal 306 funds administered through the State Department of Education are required to have a competency-based program, so this result is to be expected. It is interesting to note how few other programs had adopted this technique. In contrast, libraries and CBO were the chief users of approaches developed by Laubach Literacy Action and Literacy Volunteers of America.

Another aspect of instructional approach is the size of the instructional group. Respondents were asked whether their programs used one-on-one instruction, small groups, intermediate groups or large groups. The results are reported in Table 9. Responses indicated that CC and ABE programs grouped students in many different ways. Both one-on-one, small group and intermediate groups were popular. More than one-third of the ABE programs and one-half of the CC programs also delivered instruction to large groups of adults (more than 20 students). CBOs and LIBs, in contrast, almost never used large groups, and the proportion of programs that used only one-on-one instruction was quite high.

Table 9

Grouping of Students
(Percent of Programs)

	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
One on One	61	88	63	92
Small (3-10 Students)	56	88	68	27
Intermediate (11-20 students)	61	63	36	18
Large (20 + students)	37	50	8	0

Note: Multiple responses were permitted.

There is some confusion about instructional approach, instructional materials and curriculum because often these three elements are discussed interchangeably. For example, the Laubach approach to instruction is embodied in a set of Laubach skill books and associated materials, and inherent in these materials is an underlying curriculum. When a program indicates it is "using Laubach" they probably mean they have adopted the approach to literacy instruction (one-on-one tutorial), they are using the materials, and, as a result, they have implicitly adopted the curriculum contained in the materials.

To clarify this confusion and learn as much as possible about program intention, we also asked if each program had a written curriculum, and what that curriculum contained. Sixty-one percent of the programs reported that they had a written curriculum. The responses are broken down by program type in Table 10. Over three-quarters of the ABE and CC programs answered this question affirmatively, roughly half of the CBOs concurred, but only one-quarter of the library programs reported that they had a written curriculum.

Table 10

Presence of Written Curriculum
(Percent of Programs)

TYPE	PERCENT
ABE	78
CC	88
CBO	54
LIB	27

While most programs reported that they had a curriculum, they were not able to describe it very clearly. Overall, one-quarter of the respondents said their curriculum was "locally developed." Ten to fifteen percent said they followed a G.E.D. curriculum. A similar number said they employed a competency-based curriculum. The next two most frequent answers were an "eclectic" curriculum and a Laubach curriculum, which were reported by approximately 10% of the programs. Responses by program type are reported in Table 11.

Programs also reported that they reviewed or updated their curricula regularly. Table 12 indicates the frequency with which curricula were reviewed by each type of program. The results demonstrate that most programs are paying attention to the content of instruction. Curriculum reviews occur quite frequently for approximately one-third of the ABE, CC and CBO programs, and periodically (quarterly, semi-annually, annually, or bi-annually) for approximately half of all programs. Thus, programs are paying attention to curriculum, though they may not be able to describe it succinctly.

Table 11

Type of Written Curriculum
(Percent of Programs)

CURRICULUM TYPE	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Locally developed	33	29	23	25
G.E.D.	25	14	8	0
Competency-based Education	25	14	8	0
"Eclectic"	0	14	15	25
Laubach Literacy Action	0	0	23	25
CASAS	17	0	0	0
Other	0	29	23	25

(Other includes: Student selected materials, sight vocabulary, linguistics manual, ESL framework, Alan Hancock, Spanish materials, locally developed scope and sequence, Merrill Linguistics, etc.)

Table 12

Frequency of Curriculum Review
(Percent of Programs)

REVIEW FREQUENCY	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Annual Bi-annual	64	29	10	17
Quarterly Semi-annual	0	14	19	33
Ongoing/Frequent	29	43	43	0
Occasionally	7	14	10	17
Not reviewed	0	0	19	33

Overall, these results seem to indicate that many of the programs are synthesizing curricula and approaches from varying sources into an instructional scheme that meets their local needs. Moreover, they are reviewing these schemes regularly. It may not be correct to call these curricula in the formal sense, but the collections of approaches and materials seemed to make sense to the respondents.

How is instruction targeted to population groups. To determine whether programs tailored their activities to meet the unique needs of the English language majority as well as the language minority groups, we asked respondents whether they had specific instructional approaches or curriculum for different groups. Further, programs were asked to describe the methods and materials they used with different groups. As the results reported below will show, there was much less differentiation among populations than one might anticipate.

Respondents were asked whether they used different instructional methods with different groups, including not only language groups, but also groups based on employment status, training needs, race, and other factors. Overall, 60% of the respondents indicated that they did employ distinct approaches for different groups. These respondents were asked to describe the nature of the groups and the approaches that were used.

Before discussing these distinctions, it is worth noting that 40% of the programs did not target instruction to specific groups. This may be because the program served a narrow population or because instruction was individualized for each learner rather than for specific population groups. In fact, many of the respondents indicated that they treated each adult as an individual and met his or her unique needs. On the other hand, it may be that many programs do not have the knowledge or the resources to customize instruction to the needs of distinct classes of learners or because they believe their approach is appropriate to all the adults they serve.

The following discussion applies only to those programs that reported they used different instructional strategies for different groups. (Data relating to this topic were obtained from 38 programs.) When asked to indicate which groups were identified for different instructional methods, almost one-half of the respondents (47%) cited non-English speaking adults. Approximately 20% identified "academic" students as a group receiving a different instructional approach. (This phrase was used to distinguish certain ability groupings, e.g., "low", "middle," and "high.") Among the other groups mentioned were those with perceptual handicaps, vocational education students, GED students, ABE students, employed and unemployed adults, and amnesty applicants. However, no other group was mentioned by more than 5%-10% of the programs. In no case did respondents indicate their program distinguished between language minority groups who were literate in their primary language but not in English and those who were not literate in their primary language, though this may have occurred in practice once instruction began.

The instructional methods that were employed with these groups included many of the approaches mentioned previously in Table 8. In order of popularity they were: One-on-one instruction (19%), conversational/oral approach (16%), locally developed methods (14%), CAI (8%), small group instruction (5%), language experience approach (5%), phonics (5%), Laubach approach (5%), large group instruction (5%), and other (11%). There was no clear association between approaches and types of programs. The only association between the nature of the group and the approach occurred for non-English speaking adults who were given instruction using a conversational/oral

approach by 22% of the programs that identified them as a specific group.

Respondents were asked to indicate how the instructional approaches were selected for different groups. The results are reported in Table 13. This indicated that instructors have the primary responsibility for selecting methods in ABE and LIB programs, and play a prominent role in CC and CBO programs. CC programs relied upon needs assessments more often than the other three groups. A few programs gave the responsibility to specialists, committees and/or administrative staff.

Table 13

Selection of Instructional Methods
for Different Population Groups
(Percent of Identified Programs)

METHOD OF SELECTION	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Instructor selects	73	38	33	63
Needs Assessment	0	38	22	13
Director/Staff select	7	0	28	0
"Tried and true"	0	0	11	13
Curriculum Committee selects	7	13	0	0
Specialists select	0	0	6	13
Other	13	13	0	0

What materials are used for population groups? Results were similar when respondents were asked if they used different curriculum materials for different groups of adults. Over two-thirds of the programs indicated that they had different materials for different groups, and the group that was identified most often (approximately one-third of the programs) was the non-English speaking or ESL group. A small number of materials were mentioned for meeting the needs of the identified groups. For example, Side by Side was used by a number of programs with ESL students. Other than that, there were no clear patterns among their responses.

From all these data one can conclude that programs recognize differences among the backgrounds, skills and needs of adult learners, and accommodate them as best they can. Only a few programs offer distinct instructional approaches or materials for unique population groups. It is more common for instructors to have the responsibility for meeting the needs of the learners.

How are materials selected? Respondents were quite certain that most if not all the materials they used were designed for use with adults. Over 90% of the ABE, CC and CBO programs indicated that most or all materials were designed for use with adults; over 80% of LIB programs indicated a similar response.

There were only small differences across program types in the manner in which materials were selected. In most programs, administrators and teachers were involved in the decisions. In some cases, learners, Boards of Directors, and/or publishers were consulted.

Testing and Evaluation

The telephone survey included a large number of questions about assessment. Respondents described the tests that were used by the programs and the circumstances under which diagnostic testing was carried out. In addition they discussed the purposes of testing, and the use of results. We also obtained information about program evaluation and its impact. These results will be discussed below.

Which tests are used?. All programs indicated that adult learners were required to take at least one type of test. In fact, 85% said they used two different tests, and over one-half of all programs indicated that three tests were used. In all, over 20 different tests were used by programs in the sample. Table 14 shows the tests that were used by the largest number of programs. For example, the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) was most popular among ABE programs, and it was used by a number of CCs and CBOs as well. The Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT), the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) and the "check-ups" in Laubach skill books were popular among libraries. It is worth noting that there was wide variation in test selection. While the TABE was the most popular test, over 80% of the ABE, CBO and LIB programs also used other tests. Moreover, there was an extremely wide variety of tests used. Most ABE, CBO and LIB programs used other tests that were only used by a small number of programs. The complete list of tests mentioned by respondents will be found in Table 15.

Table 14

Testing Methods
(Percent of Programs)

TEST	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
TABE	79	25	35	9
SORT	16	0	19	27
WRAT	11	13	15	27
CASAS	26	38	8	0
Laubach Check-ups	0	0	15	27
Woodcock	5	38	8	0
Informal Reading Inventory	5	0	15	0
Stanford	0	50	4	0
Locally developed instruments	21	13	19	0
Other	84	38	81	100

Note: Up to three responses were permitted per program.

Table 15
Tests Used by At Least One Program

TEST NAME
Test of Basic English (TABE)
Slosson Oral Reading Test (SORT)
Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)
Adult Basic Learning Examination (ABLE)
San Diego Quick Assessment (SDQA)
Woodcock
READ (Literacy Volunteers of America - LVA)
Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)
Gates-McGuinney
Stanford
Rosenthal
Informal Reading Inventory
Laubach Check-Ups
California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Process (CALPEP)
Listening Comprehension Proficiency Test (LCPT)
Bader
Maryland Adult Performance Program (MAPP)
RAPP
Botell
Wepman
Betts
Reading Assessment Measure
Locally developed
Adult Performance Level (APL)

How are tests used: Monitoring ongoing performance, pre- and post-testing, etc.? Tables 16 and 17 describe the primary and secondary purposes for which tests were used by the various program types. The results indicate that tests were used most frequently for assessing adults skills and/or needs prior to instruction. The most common purpose was for placing students in classes or matching them with instructors/tutors. This occurs before instruction begins. Similarly, tests were used frequently for screening adults to determine if they met program guidelines and were eligible for service. Occasionally, tests were used for monitoring student progress or certifying competency. CBOs and libraries used tests (secondarily) for monitoring progress more often than either ABE or CC programs.

Table 16

Principal Assessment Purpose
(Percent of Programs)

PURPOSE	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Screening	19	29	13	9
Placement/Matching	63	29	38	36
Reading Comprehension	6	14	17	27
Diagnosis	6	14	0	9
Monitor Progress	6	14	21	0
Certify Competency	0	0	8	9
Other	0	0	4	9

Table 17

Secondary Assessment Purpose
(Percent of Programs)

PURPOSE	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Screening	24	20	6	13
Placement/Matching	35	20	25	25
Reading Comprehension	6	40	13	0
Diagnosis	6	0	0	0
Monitor Progress	18	0	38	25
Certify Competence	0	20	6	0
Other	18	0	13	38

(Other includes: Curriculum, reading series, program evaluation, motivation, etc.)

How is the total program evaluated? Respondents were asked to indicate how they measured the success of their programs. Test results are summarized in Table 18. Respondents from ABE programs spoke most often about grade level increases, GED passing rates, retention rates, post-test scores and competency mastery. CC respondents focused on retention rates and competency mastery, and they also mentioned course completion rates. While retention was noted most frequently by CBOs, they gave relatively more emphasis to changes in self-concept and to enrollment increases. Libraries, too, mentioned enrollment increases and changes in self-concept as important elements in program success. Surprisingly, libraries mentioned grade level increases in literacy skills more often than CBOs or CCs.

Table 18

Indications of Program Success
(Percent of Programs)

MEASURE	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Grade Level Increases	58	13	31	42
G.E.D. Passing Rate	53	13	15	8
Course Completion	42	50	15	25
Enrollment Increases	21	0	23	42
Staff Increases	11	13	4	33
Job Placement	37	0	16	25
Retention	53	63	54	25
Competency Mastery	42	38	19	25
Self-Concept Changes	26	0	23	50
Post-Test Scores	58	13	12	8
Formal Evaluation	5	0	4	8
Other	21	13	65	42

Note: Multiple responses were permitted.
(Other includes: Acquire basic skills, improve self-esteem, life enrichment, hours of instruction, individual goal attainment, awards received, student feedback, learner satisfaction, amnesty test results, accreditation, waiting list for entrance, teacher evaluations, etc.)

Sixty-three percent of the programs have been formally evaluated, and, of these, more than half said that the evaluation led to some changes in the program. Only 16% of the programs have an ongoing budget for evaluation.

The vast majority of all respondents indicated that they had to report information on program operations to a funding source. For ABE, CC and LIB programs this was the state. CBOs also reported to foundations and corporations, to their parent agency and to private funding sources. The information programs reported was primarily services delivered and goals attained. Learner progress was mentioned by fewer than one-third of the respondents. The most common information reported by programs (in order) related to the numbers of adults served, program goals attained, learner progress, attendance, and learner background data.

There may appear to be an inconsistency between the responses regarding testing and those regarding evaluation, but there is not really a conflict. Many respondents distinguished between testing (of individuals) and evaluation (of the program) and responded accordingly. For example, ABE respondents reported that they seldom tested to monitor progress or certify competence, which might lead one to conclude that they did not give post-tests. Yet over one-half said that they used post-test scores as an indication of program success. Respondents seemed to distinguish between

tests that were given to help in screening, placing or tracking individual students, and tests that were given for the purposes of program evaluation. This is one explanation for some of the apparent differences between Tables 17 and 18.

What specific elements make a successful program? To address this question respondents were asked to describe the key features that contributed to the success of their programs. If someone else wanted to use their program as a model for a new literacy project, which elements would be the most important? Responses to this question have been summarized to provide a list of critical success factors from the respondents' point of view.

This question elicited a wide variety of responses. Many different elements were mentioned, though only three ideas were repeated by large numbers of programs. As one might expect, many of the same themes emerged from these discussions as had emerged in response to the question about effective management practices. The three elements that were suggested by the greatest number of respondents were the commitment and dedication of staff, the provision of high quality training, and the importance of establishing good communication networks within the community. Additionally, respondents discussed instructional approaches, support services, assessment and monitoring, rewards and expectations, and attitudes and atmosphere. Respondents' comments will be elaborated in the following paragraphs.

The single item mentioned by the largest number of programs was "networking" with agencies and people in the community. This was true for ABE, CC, CBO and library programs. Individual respondents suggested the importance of "community support" and a "receptive community," and suggested that communication was the key to achieving these goals. A number of programs used community needs assessments to gain a greater awareness of local needs and conditions. With such information one is better able to maintain a "high profile in the community," provide appropriate services and generate community support. A few programs translated this sensitivity to local conditions into operational decisions about the location of facilities (e.g., in a shopping mall).

The second important element mentioned by a large number of respondents was staff dedication and commitment. This was mentioned primarily by ABE and CBO programs. However, it was clear that instructional personnel were important to all sectors. Other programs indicated that "qualified staff," "bilingual staff," "good staff," and "well-paid staff" were key elements to be sought after. In fact, one program conducted a staff needs assessment to help in personnel planning. Others mentioned that the well-being and attitudes of staff were important. One respondent said it was important to have a "happy staff," while others talked about the "sense of family" and "good working relationships" between instructors that were important elements of their programs.

Training was the third topic mentioned by a large number of programs of all types. They emphasized the quality of the training, not just training, per se. Two programs provided other resources related to staff development, such as conferences.

In addition to the three topics that were mentioned repeatedly, programs identified other elements that were important. In the area of instruction, a few programs said that their instructional approach or procedures were key elements in their success. However, the programs did not mention the same things. For example one program used a whole language approach, another stressed competency-based education with small steps between competencies. A couple of programs believed in one-on-one instruction, with "few or no group activities," while another said that flexibility in schedule was the most important thing. It appeared that the specific choice of approach or procedures was not as important as the fact that the program had a consistent approach. In fact, five programs mentioned the importance of having a "consensus" about what the program is and how it operates. This seems to be the key element.

A few respondents said it was important to involve the learners in program decisions, and to make decisions for their benefit not the benefit of the program or the staff. Three programs said they used technology in important ways that could benefit other programs. Support services, such as child care and counseling, were crucial in a couple of programs. Student assessment played an important role for some programs. They specifically mentioned the importance of monitoring learner progress and collecting continual assessment, not just the use of tests for placement. A couple of respondents indicated that it was important to have good organizational support, be it the board of directors or just the management of the agency. Finally, two or three programs said that high expectations for students and rewards for student accomplishment were important enough to be emulated by other programs.

Outreach and Recruitment

Outreach and recruitment are important elements in most adult literacy programs, and a number of different strategies are used to disseminate information about programs to different groups. The survey asked specifically about methods for reaching "hard to reach" adults and adults from different population groups, and about methods of disseminating program information in general.

How do the "hard to reach" illiterate adults find out about the literacy program? Respondents were asked to focus on the recruitment strategies that were most effective with "hard to reach" illiterate adults. Table 19 identifies the strategies that were effective recruitment tools with this population. Word-of-mouth and television advertising were the most frequently cited activities for promoting programs among illiterate adults who are difficult to recruit. Door-to-door canvassing and the use of outreach workers who could make personal contact were the next most often mentioned approaches. These may be promising avenues for other programs to explore.

Table 19

Strategies to Recruit "Hard to Reach"
(Percent of Programs)

STRATEGY	ABC	CC	CBO	LIB
Word of Mouth	67	29	41	56
TV Ads/PSAS	20	14	32	45
Canvassing	7	14	27	9
Outreach Worker	7	29	0	27
Flyers	33	14	0	0
Radio Ads/PSAS	0	14	14	9
Referrals from Agencies	20	14	5	9
Schools & Colleges	0	0	18	9
Newspaper/Magazine Ads	7	0	9	9
Alumni	7	14	9	0
Other	20	14	5	18

Note: Up to three responses were permitted per program.
(Other includes: Mobile unit, co-sponsoring events with other agencies personal letters to high school drop-outs, using recruiters of similar racial/ethnic group, etc.)

Sixty-four percent of the respondents acknowledged that certain recruitment strategies work better with certain groups of learners. For example, one noted that it is important to go to the homes of handicapped adults. Others commented that audio approaches are better than printed materials for illiterate adults, that special interest radio and TV stations are good methods for communicating with non-English speaking groups, Black adults, etc., that pastors and church organizations have credibility with certain groups, and that program participants and alumni can speak effectively to their friends and neighbors. Most of these approaches were developed by the local program staff through trial and error and experience.

What media or printed material strategies do programs use to recruit tutors, etc.? Different strategies were effective for recruiting instructors. Table 20 shows the percent of programs of each type using different methods for recruiting instructors. It is apparent at first glance that fewer techniques are employed for attracting instructors than for attracting adult learners. Newspaper and television advertisements are the most commonly used methods. The central district office provides staff for many ABE and CC programs, and referrals from other programs or agencies are important to all four types of programs.

Table 20

Recruiting Instructors
(Percent of Programs)

	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Flyers	7	0	0	36
Door to Door Canvassing	0	0	5	0
Newspaper Ads	43	25	45	55
Newspaper Articles	0	0	9	18
Toll-Free Phone	7	0	5	0
Radio Ads	0	0	14	36
Television Ads	0	25	18	45
Word of Mouth	7	13	23	9
Alumni Recommendation	7	13	5	0
Referrals	21	38	27	18
School and College	0	0	14	0
District Office	36	13	0	0
Churches	0	0	14	0
Other	0	0	23	9

Note: Multiple responses were permitted.
(Other includes: Outreach worker, signs, students of the month advertising campaign, etc.)

What different kinds of outreach and recruiting activities do program use? Table 21 shows the percent of programs employing various strategies to recruit adult learners in general. When asked how learners found out about their program, respondents most often reported "word of mouth." Referrals from other agencies were another important source of information for prospective students, as were radio and television advertising and flyers distributed in various locations. The table also indicates that most programs were involved in many different outreach activities.

Table 21

Recruitment Methods
(Percent of Programs)

STRATEGY	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Flyers	58	75	36	33
Door to Door Canvassing	11	0	12	8
Newspaper/Magazine Ads	42	25	27	42
Newspaper Articles	16	13	27	25
Toll-Free Phone	5	0	12	33
Radio Ads	63	50	35	75
TV Ads	37	50	42	75
Catalogue	26	25	8	17
Word of Mouth	89	75	77	92
Alumni Recommendation	26	25	15	33
Market Research	16	13	0	8
Co-Sponsoring Events	5	0	8	8
Referrals from Agencies	63	73	54	75
Outreach Worker	5	0	4	0
Other	42	38	31	55

Note: Multiple responses were permitted.
(Other includes: Public forums and events, church activities and church bulletins, brochures, enclosures in payroll envelopes, mailings, advertising expert, career day, PLUS Campaign, job site recruiting by union, etc.)

Learner Retention

The survey addressed the question of retention from two different points of view. We examined the services that were provided to encourage learners to remain in the program and we asked about the reasons learners leave the program.

For what reasons do learners remain in programs? Programs reported that they provided a number of different kinds of support services to help meet the needs of adults who were participating in the program. Table 22 shows the percent of programs of each type that provided various supplemental services to encourage adults to remain in the program. ABE and CC programs provided the greatest number of supplemental services. More than one-half of the ABE programs offered personal counseling, academic counseling, and career guidance. One-half of the CC programs offered personal counseling, career guidance and student support groups. Approximately one-quarter of the ABE, CC and CBOs offered child care and transportation. Student support groups were also popular with CBOs and LIBs.

Table 22

Support Services
(Percent of Programs)

SERVICE	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Personal Counseling	67	50	19	8
Academic Counseling	61	25	12	8
Career Counseling	72	50	23	0
Child Care	39	38	23	8
Transportation	28	25	15	0
Job Placement/Referral	22	0	23	8
Other	39	63	58	58

Note: Multiple responses were permitted.
(Other includes: Student support group, student newspaper, informal counseling, field trips and concerts, links with other agencies, student recognition program, phone calls from director, translators, comfortable location, student participation, awards, potluck meals, referrals to ABE programs, incentives for attendance, free supplies, nurse, etc.)

Programs did other things to accommodate the needs of students. For example, most programs offered instruction both during the day and at night. Approximately one-half of the instruction provided by all sectors was offered at night. Similarly, programs offered classes in varying locations. In fact, most organizations offered instruction in 10 or 20 different locations. The average number of locations in which instruction was offered was 20 for ABE programs, 15 for CC programs, 9 for CBO programs and 27 for LIB programs. Table 23 contains additional information about the type of locations in which instruction was offered. This included libraries, community centers, churches, homes, schools, businesses, and many other locations. Library programs offered instruction in more different types of locations than ABE, CC or CBO programs.

For what reasons do learners leave or quit programs? The other side of the retention question is why learners leave programs once they have begun. Table 24 reports on the reasons adults leave literacy programs, according to the respondents in this study. It is important to note that Table 24 does not reflect the percent of adults who leave for each reason. While this information would be of great interest, it was not generally available. Instead, the table contains the percent of programs that mentioned each reason. The most frequently mentioned reason learners leave is that they have achieved success, either in terms of the programs criteria or their own goals. Many leave when they find a job that interferes with their schedule. However, respondents also indicated that significant numbers leave without achieving success. For example, many adults leave programs because of family or medical concerns, changes in work, or because they move to another location. And there are many whose reason for leaving is unknown.

Table 23

Location of Instructional Services
(Percent of Programs)

LOCATION	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Libraries	21	63	36	80
Community Centers	43	50	50	30
Churches	36	50	41	50
Homes	0	13	27	70
Schools	57	50	4	20
Colleges	14	38	0	0
Businesses	7	0	23	20
Senior Centers	14	0	0	20
Other	42	13	36	20

Note: Up to four responses were permitted per program.
(Other includes: health centers, shopping center, prisons, etc.)

Table 24

Potential Reasons Why Learners Leave Programs
According To Respondents
(Percent of Programs)

REASON	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Achieved Program Success	53	100	42	50
Work Change	35	50	31	50
Met Literacy Goals	35	38	38	50
Found Job	41	38	23	25
Moved	41	50	50	42
Incarcerated	6	13	8	17
Referred to Other Program	12	13	4	25
Unknown	18	0	12	17
Family/Medical Concerns	53	63	36	50
Other	41	25	54	58

(Other includes: Child care, following crops, frustration, scheduling, transportation, outside responsibilities, life crises, discouragement, release from incarceration, inappropriate goals, etc.)

Respondents were asked about attrition and retention rates for their program, and approximately 80% said that they had such information. However, fewer than half of the programs were able to provide specific information. Table 25 contains the information obtained regarding retention and attrition. Programs did not have common definitions for these two terms; some computed graduation rates, some continuation rates, some course completion rates, etc. The row labelled retention combines estimates of positive progress, including graduation, completion and retention rates. The row labelled attrition combines estimates of interrupted contact, including drop-outs and leavers. CBOs reported the highest retention/completion rates and libraries the lowest. None of the community colleges were able to supply data on attrition or retention. When reviewing these data one must keep in mind that these averages are based on approximately one-third of the sample. Therefore, they should be interpreted with caution.

Program Management

The broad topic of program management was subdivided into three smaller issues: human resources, costs, and management practices. Each program was asked to describe the number and qualifications of key paid and volunteer staff, to delineate the total project budget and the source of the funds, and to describe the manner in which the program was managed and the management and leadership practices that contributed to its success. Some of these data were presented in the initial descriptive section on the nature and size of the programs, and those Tables will be referenced in the discussion that follows.

Table 25

Retention and Attrition Rates
(Percent of sample responding)

RATE	MEAN PERCENTAGE			
	ABE (N=42)	CC (N=0)	CBO (N=42)	LIB (N=50)
Retention/Graduation	66	--	71	48
Attrition/Drop-out	26	--	29	43

What kinds of human resources do projects have? The vast majority of staff in the sampled adult literacy programs (both paid and volunteer) serve in instructional roles. Table 6 contains information about the number of paid and volunteer instructors used in each program type. As was noted in the earlier discussion, while ABE and CC programs employed larger numbers of teachers than the CBOs or LIBs, the community based organizations and libraries utilized the services of many more volunteers. Table 7 contains the results of a separate question about the percent of staff who were volunteers, and it confirms the results regarding the proportion of volunteers used by different program types.

All programs indicated that there were other, non-teaching personnel, who played important roles. These included the project directors, coordinators, publicists, clerks and office workers, counselors, members of the board of directors, teacher aides, financial managers and others. Table 26 contains information about the types of non-teaching personnel used by literacy programs. Respondents were asked to indicate whether there were non-teaching staff who were important to the program. Interestingly, most failed to mention themselves. Less than one-quarter of the programs cited the project director as key staff person. However, the vast majority mentioned one or more non-teaching staff in other roles. Though it was not reported in Table 26, frequently there were two or more people acting as coordinators, office staff, teachers' aides, counselors or serving on the board of directors.

Respondents also reported that they worked with other agencies to provide supplemental services needed by participants. Approximately 70% of the programs had such arrangements.

Table 26

Important Non-teaching Personnel
(Percent of Programs)

CLASSIFICATION	ABE	CC	CBO	LIB
Director	18	38	23	27
Coordinator	41	50	45	54
Office Staff	41	75	27	64
Teacher Aide	41	13	18	9
Board of Directors	6	25	14	18
Counselor	35	13	32	0
Publicist/Writer	6	25	23	18
Fund Raiser	0	13	5	9
Financial Manager	0	0	18	0
Curriculum Specialist	6	0	9	0
Training Consultant	6	0	22	9
Assessment Specialist	6	13	5	9
Data Processing Specialist	0	25	14	9
Outreach Worker	0	0	5	0
Other	47	25	41	64

Note: Up to five response permitted per program.
(Other includes: Educational aides, child care worker, van driver, nurse, clinician, children's librarian, etc.)

Finally, most programs utilized volunteers to help improve services and meet the needs of adult learners. As noted above, library programs rely on volunteers as their primary instructors. ABE, CC and CBOs also use volunteers as instructors and/or tutors. In addition, most programs use volunteers as clerks and office workers, fund raisers, publicists, aides and in other roles. In fact the average number of volunteers associated with programs in this study was 31 for ABE programs, 50 for CC programs, 64 for CBO programs and 58 for LIB programs.

What are the actual costs of maintaining successful programs?
Respondents were asked to provide information about the project's total operating budget and about the sources of these funds. Table 3 displays the mean and median budgets for programs in each of the four sectors. Adult basic education programs had the largest budgets, followed by community colleges and community based organizations. In general, library programs operated with the smallest total budgets. However, there was tremendous variability in all the reported figures. There were wide ranges of budgets within program types, and some large CBO and LIB programs had budgets that were greater than those of small ABE and CC programs. As we noted in the previous discussion. These figures reflect only those programs identified in our purposeful sample. There are many other projects, particularly CBO and LIB, that operate with much smaller budgets.

To clarify the budget figures, respondents were asked to indicate the sources for these funds. Unfortunately, not all were able to provide accurate information in response to this question. Table 27 shows the mean percent of the total budget derived from each of ten different sources. These figures are based on a subsample of 47 programs that provided complete budget information. On the whole, state revenues were the single largest source of funds for most programs. In fact, state funds provided almost two-thirds of the operating budgets for CC and LIB programs and approximately half of the funds for ABE programs. On the average, federal sources provided a much smaller share of the resources used by programs. Unfortunately, some respondents did not indicate whether the federal funds were from immigration (IRCA), job training (JTPA) or welfare (GAIN in California) programs or were other federal programs. Thus the general "federal funds" category in Table 27 may contain resources from these three sources as well as others. Combining all federal sources shows that ABE and CC received 21% and 15% of their budgets from federal funds, respectively, compared to 13% and 10% for LIB and CBO. Libraries received a larger proportion of funds from city governments than the other three types of programs. Finally, foundation and corporation grants and local fund raising were major sources of revenues for CBOs, accounting for more than one-third of their total budgets.

Table 27

Percent of Funds from Various Sources

SOURCE	MEAN PERCENTAGE			
	ABE (N=14)	CC (N=6)	CBO (N=15)	LIB (N=11)
State Allocation	47	69	25	65
City funds	6	2	2	12
Immigration (IRCA)	3	0	0	0
Job Training (JTPA)	7	4	1	0
Welfare (GAIN)	5	0	0	0
Federal funds	6	11	9	13
Foundation grants	7	0	24	3
Corporate donations	0	0	14	0
Local funds raising	10	0	7	1
Other	7	13	18	6

Note: Federal funds may include IRCA, JTPA and/or GAIN.

What are the leadership qualities of those who manage the program? Respondents described a number of special management practices that contributed to the success of their programs. Approximately 90 different items were mentioned, including such things as formal communication strategies, organizational styles and the overall program approach. The responses were analyzed and grouped into ten clusters of related issues. The clusters were classified into four major categories: Organizational Style, Personal Characteristics, General Program Approach and Procedures, and these categories will be used to organize the discussion of management practices.

The first category of management practices was called Organization Style, and they are directly related to the leadership qualities of the program managers. Respondents commented on these issues more frequently than on any others, indicating there was the greatest agreement across programs on the importance of these practices. Under the broad heading of Organizational Style were three related sub-topics: Accessibility, Communication, and Shared Responsibility. Many respondents indicated that the accessibility of the director and the staff was a key element in the success of the program. Four respondents used almost the same words, "The project director is available and open." Others focused on the availability of staff, "The instructors and staff are accessible to learners and tutors." Overall, accessibility was the most frequently mentioned feature of the successful programs.

Communication is closely related to accessibility. If the project director and staff have an open and available leadership style there is likely to be greater exchange of information and ideas, i.e., greater communication. Some respondents focused specifically on the importance of communication, so these comments were grouped into a specific cluster. We distinguished between responses that related to formal mechanisms for communication and those that described informal communication networks, but they are clearly interrelated. Formalized strategies to promote communication were mentioned quite frequently in response to questions about effective management practices. These included such things as frequent staff meetings, newsletters, and regular committee meetings to address topics of interest to staff. On a more informal basis respondents had praise for practices such as "coordinator has personal contact with tutors," "close touch with tutors," and "supervisors maintain constant communication." In general, there was wide agreement on the importance of communication among staff for effective management.

The third element of organizational style was shared responsibility. The phrase most often used by respondents was "teamwork." The data suggest that teamwork involves both communication and distribution of responsibility. One respondent noted that the program was effective because "staff were involved in all levels of decision making." Another said that the director was effective because of a "participation management style." Many programs also shared responsibility with learners. "Students are involved at all management levels," was one response. In another program learners served on the literacy council and were included in planning. Overall, there was much support for the notion that effective programs shared information among staff and learners and involved them in planning and decision making.

Personal Characteristics was the second category we derived from the comments of the program administrators who were interviewed. The characteristics that they mentioned most frequently were commitment and dedication. Respondents praised the "dedicated staff," and the "enthusiastic volunteer tutors" who "work 12 hours a day" (combining comments from three sources). While these are not really management practices, they were a common response to our questions about management. It may be that administrators who are open and accessible and share responsibility in meaningful ways are more likely to generate such dedication from instructors.

Under the heading of General Program Approach were clusters of comments relating to relationships with the community, and to goals and objectives. One practice that was effective for many programs was to establish good working relationships with groups or agencies in the local community. One respondent called this "networking with the community," while others described "involvement with the population," "close touch with agencies," and a "strong bond between the employment and education sectors." Such connections to the local community helped many programs to recruit, to publicize, to be more responsive to needs or to offer better services. In addition to these comments about community connections, four or five respondents discussed the importance of clear goals and objectives. As one said, you need to "know your philosophy and your mission" to focus your activities. Another noted that the goals had to be "realistic."

The final category contained comments relating to Program Procedures. There were a few respondents who suggested that their success was due to specific procedures they employed. These related to staff development, matching adult learners with teachers, and providing specialized support. One or two respondents indicated that they thought the training they provided was a key element in their success. A couple also commented on the importance of effective matching between adult learners and tutors. (These programs provided one-on-one instruction.) Finally, two programs cited the support services they offered, specifically Reading and Curriculum specialists.

Overall we found that the bulk of the responses to our questions on management practices related to leadership -- personal style and characteristics -- rather than to specific procedures. This suggests that effective programs are built more on personal relationships than on specific methods or materials.

<u>What is the cost per unit of service</u>? Since no program has unlimited resources, each program must consider costs when making programmatic or administrative decisions. Total budgets provide only limited information about the costs associated with alternative program options. Instead, it is much more useful to know the cost associated with a specific unit of service. In this instance, an appropriate indicator might be how much each program spends, on the average, to provide literacy services to an adult learner.

The study obtained information about costs per unit of service in two ways. First, respondents were asked to provide whatever estimates of cost per service they had already calculated. This included estimates of the cost per pupil, the cost per instructor and/or the cost per instructional hour. Since

these numbers are widely discussed and some programs are required to report information in this form to funding agencies, we anticipated that most would be able to supply at least one estimate. Second, because we obtained information about the number of instructors (both paid and volunteer), the number of pupils served, and the total budget, it was possible to calculate directly an estimate of either the cost per teacher or the cost per pupil.

Unfortunately, the results of both analyses were dissatisfying. Approximately one-half of the program were able to supply information in one form or another. The rest of the programs either did not calculate these statistics or did not wish to report them. Those programs that provided some estimate of cost per unit of service usually reported per-pupil cost. Fewer than 30% of the programs reported costs per instructional hour, and fewer than 20% reported cost per instructor. In general, cost information was obtained more frequently from community colleges than from any of the other types of programs.

The cost data that were obtained from the programs varied so greatly that one questions their accuracy. The range of per pupil costs reported by programs of each type will be found in Table 28. In each case, not only was the range of values broad, but the individual results were widely distributed within the ranges. Furthermore, we found no clear links between costs per pupil and other program characteristics. As a result, we were unable to interpret the cost data further. Similarly, the cost estimates we calculated based on the number of instructors (paid and/or volunteer), the number of pupils served and the total budgets were unsatisfactory. The results varied widely within program categories as well as between program categories.

Table 28

Range of Per-Pupil Costs

TYPE	RANGE
ABE	$ 50 - $ 1,250
CC	$ 52 - $ 692
CBO	$ 123 - $ 3,600
LIB	$ 100 - $ 500

This experience offers a lesson about the complexity of this type of analysis. One encounters problems of definition, as well as accuracy. The definitional problems center on how one counts pupils and instructors. In such analyses one usually establishes a profile of a typical student and counts non-typical students proportionally. For example, a full-time student at a college may be one who is taking 12 or more units, and a typical student in grades K-12 is one who is enrolled for at least 5 hours of instruction for the full school year. However, it can be much more difficult to establish a

profile for a typical adult literacy student. For example, an adult learner in a library literacy program may be receiving individual tutoring for as few as two hours per week or as many as ten or fifteen hours, and the tutoring may continue for as few as two months or as long as three years. How does one count the number of adults served over a year?

The problem is further complicated when comparing across programs that deliver services in different ways, as ABE, CC, CBO and LIB programs do. For example, community colleges may report data in one form (e.g., the number of full time equivalent students they serve--FTE), while ABE programs report data in another form (the average daily attendance--ADA). One cannot always convert from one method to the other. Even the number of instructional hours is difficult to count, because some programs deliver instruction in groups while others deliver instruction to individuals. Similar problems are encountered trying to count instructors. Not only do some instructors teach full-time while others teach part-time, but there are different definitions for full and part-time depending on the type of program.

These problems help to explain the wide variation we found in costs per unit of service. In addition, we suspect that there were wide differences in accuracy between the numbers that were reported. Programs that rely on "head counts" for funding are under different pressures and devote different levels of resources to the task than programs that do not depend on such tally for funding. Because of problems with definitions and accuracy, we were not able to report reliable data regarding cost per unit of service. This is an important question that deserves further investigation. However, it will not be a simple question to answer.

Replication

One of the principal purposes for investigating effective adult literacy programs was to identify practices and features that might be shared with other service providers. It was hoped that information about effective practices would be disseminated to existing literacy programs and would be incorporated into guidelines for new projects. In fact, it may be appropriate to try to replicate highly successful models on a much wider basis.

The list of key program features discussed in an earlier section provides a good starting point for replication or dissemination activities, and it should be reviewed carefully for the valuable information it contains about replication. However, this information, by itself, ignores one important consideration. Are their special local conditions that contribute to the success of a program that might not be present in another location? An awareness of the unique circumstances that contribute to program success is an important element of replicability. As a result, we also asked respondents to share information about key conditions that might not exist in other locales.

Special conditions. The majority of the respondents indicated that there were special local circumstances that contributed to the success of their program which might not be present in other locations. The absence of these elements would negatively affect any attempt to duplicate their program

elsewhere. The conditions they described can be summarized under four major headings: Community Support, Socio-economic & Cultural conditions, Resources, and Operations.

Many programs noted the importance of support from the local community. While these were the perceptions of the program administrators, they seem consistent and generalizable. Respondents referred to specific assistance provided by other agencies, news media, employers, government offices, and funding agents. For example, one program was able to disseminate information to everyone in the community by using the only local newspaper. This was a very efficient and cost-effective way to contact the general community. Another indicated that the library had already established itself as the center of activity in the community, and this provided a hub for communication that might not be present anywhere else. Others mentioned support from the local media, government agencies, employers and funding agents. Each was important, and might not be available to provide key assistance in a different locale.

The second set of special conditions described by respondents related to socio-economic and cultural factors. A few respondents mentioned changes in the local economy that displaced workers and created special needs and opportunities. Another indicated that the program was responding to an influx of undocumented aliens and success in meeting their needs would not necessarily translate to a different type of client. Similarly, agricultural communities and border communities have special characteristics that might not be present in other areas. Finally, four or five respondents mentioned that the racial/ethnic background of the local community created unusual circumstances that affected the way they operated and would potentially affect the transferability of their approach to other locations.

Financial support was the third condition that was mentioned in response to our inquiry regarding unique local factors. Programs in affluent communities and those with special funding agencies said that the existence of greater financial support was a key element that might not be replicable. For example, certain foundations only make grants to specific states or municipalities. Similarly, large urban areas may offer more resources than other locations.

Finally, a few programs mentioned special operational features that might not exist elsewhere. First on the list of operational features was autonomy. Two libraries felt strongly that the autonomy they enjoyed (and programs might not enjoy) was important. One respondent indicated that the program's ability to operate 24 hours per day was critical. This would not be possible in some locations. Similarly, complete individualization might not be feasible for some adult literacy programs, but it was considered key by at least one respondent.

Thus, many program administrators who responded to the survey identified unique aspects of their programs that might not be replicated easily in other places. They discussed features such as communication networks, concrete support from other agencies and organizations and cultural-economic factors. Seldom were instructional approaches or materials mentioned, as these can be

replicated with ease. Yet, the evidence gathered from the survey suggests that these may not be the most important elements. Personal factors, such as those described in the discussion of management practices, understanding of local needs and conditions, and the effective use of community resources seem to play a major role in literacy program success.

PART III:

ONSITE VISITS

III. ON-SITE VISITS

Introduction

To supplement the information collected through the telephone survey, we conducted several on-site visits to a selected sample of programs included in the telephone survey. The site visits were conducted at a small number of noteworthy programs to enhance the data collected through the telephone survey. The data obtained from the site visits were analyzed and the results provided an additional empirical basis for examining exemplary practices in these programs.

Procedures

Sampling. The first step was to develop criteria to use to select the exemplary programs to be visited. The criteria identified for selecting the programs were as follows:

- Type of Project (e.g., Community Based, Community College, ABE, Library programs or Cooperative Network)
- Number of components identified as exemplary
- Relevance to California's Literacy Network
- Accessibility and willingness to be visited

Applying these criteria across the 68 programs, four programs were identified for visitations. The four programs were:

(1) Project Read - North San Mateo County, Project Director: Leslie Sheldon (CBO)

(2) San Diego County Literacy Network, Director: Pam Carlisle (Library/CBO)

(3) Sweetwater Union High School District, Division of Adult Education, Director: Jerry Rindone, (ABE)

(4) Center for Literacy, Philadelphia, PA, Director: JoAnn Weinberger, (CBO)

The selected programs represent only those programs included in the telephone survey and do not represent all possible literacy providers.

Development of the visitation protocol. The purpose of the on-site visits was to gather information that would confirm and enhance the data collected through the telephone survey. This included information on program goals, learner goals, instructional methods and materials, student assessment and evaluation, recruitment and retention, staffing and staff development, and success factors and replicability.

A visitation guide was developed to facilitate the data gathering. The guide was developed through an interactive process of reviewing the telephone survey data. As the data were being analyzed, questions or issues were noted regarding the need for elaboration or enhancement of the data. This information was employed to develop the series of questions for the on-site interviews.

Conducting the site visitations. Visitations were conducted by three ETS staff members. Most of the staff who conducted the interviews were involved in the development of the Protocol and were familiar with the content.

The site visits were designed to last one day, so advance arrangements were made with the programs. Each program was contacted by phone to make arrangements for the visit and interviews with program staff and adult learners. All visits were completed during the month of May. Additional materials were collected at the site visits and were incorporated into the data for this report.

Results: Program Goals

Translating goals into services. All of the programs had the ultimate goal of "meeting learner needs." With this as the impetus, the focus of translating this goal into service to learners was somewhat different for each of the programs. For example:

For Project Read, the goal of "meeting learners needs" gets translated into service by integrating the goal into all activities of the project. Especially during their training, teachers and tutors are given guidance on how to work with learners to meet their individual goals. Even though specific materials are introduced during the training, most of the training focuses on how to work with learners individually and match materials to specific learner goals.

In the Sweetwater Program, learners' needs are the basis for developing program goals, although institutional goals are not ignored. The Sweetwater project participates in the GAIN program. The rules and regulations surrounding the GAIN program must be met. However, Sweetwater has developed a system to offer each learner individualized attention, particularly through an adaptable Adult Basic Education, GED, ESL program, and through a comprehensive Computer Assisted Instructional Network.

The San Diego Literacy Network approached program goals through a thorough analysis of learner needs. They expect each project under the Network to be different, since the needs of the learners in the greater San Diego County are different.

Important factors to achieve the goals. Several factors emerged as important to the achievement of the goals related to meeting learner needs. One of the projects had a full-time person in charge of working with teachers

and tutors. Contact with tutors is made frequently by phone with conversations focusing on how learner needs are being met and what strategies are being employed. This was viewed as critical to their goal attainment.

Each of the projects demonstrated a high degree of staff morale. The teachers, tutors, and administrators believe in what they are doing and enjoy their work. The over-arching goal of helping adults improve their literacy provides the direction of what must be done on a day-to-day basis to attain the goals.

Generally the programs feel goals are achieved because the staff adheres to needs of learners and the goals of the program. The philosophy of the staff is to meet the individual needs of learners through a wide range of resources. If the resources are not available locally, they search for the resources to help meet the specific needs of each learner.

Relationship with other programs with similar goals. One of the factors that has made the programs exemplary is the strong collaboration and coordination networks that have been set up among literacy providers with similar goals. Generally, if the programs cannot provide the service, they know where to get it or where to refer the learner.

In the case of Project Read, the surrounding Community College programs and Adult Schools have similar goals. However, there is no competition because of the coordination that exists between them and the intricate referral system they have developed. The coordination began in 1986 by setting up a Literacy Council to accomplish three goals:

1. Communication between providers
2. Awareness of services
3. Joint outreach efforts

The Program has been extremely successful using this council. The council consists of the following community sectors:

* Literacy providers
* Business
* Community organizations
* Churches
* High schools
* PTA
* Senior citizen groups
* Department of Rehabilitation
* Support of Social Services

The Literacy Council meets quarterly to share ideas and activities and to coordinate services and outreach activities.

The same model is used by the San Diego County Literacy Network which convenes a total of eleven projects on a monthly basis to discuss learner needs, program goals and funding opportunities. They refer adult learners to one of the eleven network members depending on the location of services or

specific needs of the learner. For instance, if learners need tutoring, the Network refers them to the Carlsbad City Library Adult Learning Program or Laubach Literacy Council. If the learners want to get a GED, they are referred to the San Diego Community College District Continuing Education Department.

The networks require a commitment from each member for support of each others' programs. They recognize that they cannot solve the literacy problem alone.

Results: Adult Learner Goals

Addressing specific goals of learners. All programs indicated that in order to meet specific learners' goals, two prerequisites were met. First of all, all programs assessed the needs of each learner. Although each program may use a different instrument, all use an assessment that is reliable, easy and requires little administration time.

The initial assessment determines the reading level or grade level of the adult learner. All the programs indicated that they shared the assessment results with the learners. The adult learner is then counselled to enter a particular program.

The second important factor is training. Instruction on how to meet learner goals is the focus of training. The training requires teachers and tutors to take actual learner goals, and develop lesson plans to meet their goals. Each lesson is critiqued by others to help improve each others' skills. The office staff works hard to empower the learners with a recognition of their right to make decisions and determine their participation in the program.

Uniqueness of learner goals. The adult learners served by these projects are not necessarily unique. However, the limited English proficient student and the native speakers may receive different instructional services. The type of teaching and tutoring methodologies may vary for these learners, but the approach to meeting their individual needs does not.

Problems in meetings learner goals. Several key problems were mentioned by the programs related to meeting the goals of the learners. These problems are listed below in order of importance.

- Geographic location of learners and tutors: It is difficult to monitor the activities of the tutor and learner when only a phone can be used for contact.
- Lack of information about available services: Many adult learners are unaware of existing resources.
- Tutor attrition: The turnover of tutors creates a constant need for training.
- Learner attrition: Learner attrition creates a problem for planning instruction and monitoring progress.

Results: Instructional Methods and Materials

Approach and materials. In general the programs stress individualization of instruction and the use of a variety of materials for instruction.

In the Sweetwater Program all students reading below the seventh grade level are considered in need of literacy services. However, there is a three prong approach to providing these services. The district provides, 1) adult basic education for GED learners, 2) ESL instruction for limited English proficient students, and 3) one-on-one tutoring for native speakers who possess very low reading skills. A unique feature of the Sweetwater program is that all students are supported by a Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) program in addition to classroom instruction or one-on-one tutoring.

The Center For Literacy (CFL) approach to teaching reading is designed to teach adults according to what works for them. Although at one time CFL used a single reading series as the main focus of its instruction, the Center's approach has evolved to a more holistic view. As a result, they do not use a single book or series but rather they structure instruction around four dimensions: 1) student goals, 2) practice in reading, 3) writing, and 4) language skills. Even for programs that specify materials (e.g., ESL or GED), students are encouraged to choose their own materials, and tutors are encouraged to suggest the use of a variety of materials.

In the case of Project Read, the project director feels strongly that adults learn best in a one-to-one tutoring session. A mixture of approaches is recommended but focus is placed on one-to-one teaching, because most of the learning takes place after a close relationship between the learner and tutor has developed. The materials used are selected because of availability. The most useful and effective materials are developed by the tutors after the comprehensive training sessions. Some of the locally developed materials include the use of pictures and newspaper articles. Some tutors use the project newsletter in their lessons.

Relationship of approach and materials to program success. The learner directed approach is the center piece of these programs. The materials are just tools for the approach. A recognition of the needs of the learners, whether they be ESL, welfare mothers, or individuals who had a poor experience in elementary and secondary education is the cornerstone of the approaches used in these projects.

CFL has access to a unique resource in Philadelphia: the Reader Development Program in the city's Free library system. The Library maintains a sizable collection of books published especially for adult beginning readers. Through the Reader Development Program, literacy organizations and tutors may obtain large numbers of books without library cards.

Uniqueness of learners and effectiveness of materials. Most of the program directors mentioned that there was nothing unique about their clients

that made their particular approach or materials effective. What was important is that the focus of the programs was learner-centered and learner-directed.

Recommendation of approaches and materials. The program strongly recommended a learner-directed approach. In terms of materials, the recommendation was to employ a multi-method approach to meet the individual learner's goals. No emphasis was placed on either published or locally developed materials.

Results: Student Assessment and Evaluation

Importance of testing to project. For most programs, testing is used during the intake process. Diagnostic information from such tests as the Rosenthal Test, Life Skills Test, CASAS, and WRAT provide teachers and tutors with information to assist them in the planning of their lessons.

Ability to judge program success. Most of the programs were not satisfied with their current ability to judge the success of the programs. They would like specific information about the accomplishment of specific learners' goals. The information provided by CALPEP may prove to be the answer. However, the information is only as good as the person who records it. If the teacher or tutor does not help the learner create measurable goals, the data collected on each goal will have a lot of variability. It would not give you an accurate picture of the progress. Tutors should be trained to write measurable and reasonable goals for learners

At CFL, coordinators check on students every 50 hours of instruction or six months. The purpose of this follow-up is to review the students' goals and tutors' perspectives on progress. In addition, the six-month assessment includes some reading and writing tasks. Coordinators use the results of the six month assessment to monitor the effectiveness of the curriculum.

The program staff felt strongly about two issues related to evaluation.

1. Minimize standardized testing - do only when critical, and
2. Set up a multi-pronged data gathering system to collect teacher, tutor, learner, community and provider information.

Results: Recruitment and Retention

Effective approaches. Most of the program directors felt strongly that the most effective recruitment strategies were television and radio spots, and word-of-mouth, especially after your program gains a good reputation. Cable television spots have recently been very successful for some of the programs.

Recruitment coordination with other programs. Most of the programs use literacy councils and networks to coordinate recruitment of learners. This type of joint outreach maximizes the coverage of the community. With this type of coordination, a constant flow of learners is provided to the various literacy service providers. As an example, in Philadelphia, students are

referred to CFL from social service agencies, employers, unions, neighborhood organizations, and the Mayor's Commission on Literacy.

Results: Support Services

Important services to adults. Each of the programs had a strong social service referral program. In Sweetwater, a full-time counselor is employed to work with the adult learners. The San Diego County Network maintains a comprehensive file on government and private agencies that offer help in housing, child care, and job placement.

The projects provide a number of social activities that interest the learners such as potlucks and celebration dinners. For Project Read, the most effective support activity for retaining learners has been the study group. The study group is an open-entry group that provides discussion on all issues. The session begins with a picture that is handed to each participant and a discussion ensues. The study group discussions are held quarterly.

Recommendation for other programs to provide services. The program directors believe that a comprehensive and accurate list of agencies that can meet some of the social needs of the adult learner is essential. Certain specific activities may or may not work for other programs. But what is important is to get the learners to take control of their lives. This will assist the teachers and tutors to focus on their learning needs, since their social and economic needs are being met elsewhere.

Preventing attrition. For most programs, the most effective activity to retain students has been to get them involved. The learners are told initially that they must tell the teachers or tutors what they want to accomplish. The learners are given a constant opportunity to get involved in the programs. The programs established learner advisory groups and learner/tutor advisory committees to help give direction to the programs. These advisory groups have been well attended and the input from learners and tutors has been very useful for program planning. These activities helped develop learner leadership skills and were considered an important part of the programs by the learners interviewed.

Recommendation for other programs. When programs were asked what they would recommend to other programs to prevent attrition, the following responses were provided:

a. Stay in touch with learners - they normally feel isolated.
b. Be flexible with learners.
c. Work with other agencies to ease tensions of learners. For example, working closely with the Department of Rehabilitation to get people back to work so they can focus on improving their literacy skills.

Results: Staffing and Staff Development

Important staff qualifications. In general, the programs felt that successful staff are warm, outgoing, non-judgmental, relate to people well, and have broad skills and special skills in a literacy related area. In the

case of Sweetwater, certified teachers were considered a prerequisite to success. They believed that training cannot replace the knowledge and skills acquired by certificated teachers.

The Project Read staff identified several pre-requisites for success in literacy programs:

a. Interest in adult learners
b. Education in teaching and reading
c. Experience in management of people
d. Certificated teachers

Training and program success. For most programs, training was considered the key to their success. For example, in Project Read, the learner-centered/learner-directed approach is taught and practiced in the training sessions. Tutors are brought in after 6 weeks of their initial tutoring, for a refresher with the tutor coordinator. Materials and lesson plans are reviewed to insure that they are matching the individual learner's goals.

Successful staff development activities. For most of the programs, the following activities were suggested as important staff development activities:

a. Using real learner profiles to train tutors during the training
b. Follow-up with new teachers or tutors on a frequent basis
c. Phone contact with all tutors and teachers to monitor their activities

Results: Success and Replicability

Success factors. The following factors were identified as key to the success for each of the programs. These factors represent the most frequent responses to the question:

a. Skilled staff
b. Successful training
c. Uniform focus throughout the project
d. Learner involvement in the project
e. Coordination with other agencies and adult learner programs
f. Certificated teachers
g. Coordination between teachers and tutors
h. Adherence to the goals of the project
i. Learner-focused materials
j. Compassionate staff
k. Flexibility with locations and scheduling
l. Real world materials

Program strengths. All four programs visited indicated that the following elements are considered the strengths of their operation:

a. Training
b. Monitoring system for tutors
c. Learner-centered approach
d. Coordination through Literacy Councils, Commissions or Networks
e. Computer Assisted Instruction Program
f. Access to a variety of materials

Summary

The on-site visits confirmed a number of findings obtained during the literature review and the telephone surveys. The visits indicated that the following factors promote exemplary practices among literacy programs:

a. The program must meet the learners' individual needs. The program must be learner-centered and learner-directed.
b. The program must have a well-trained, knowledgeable, and caring staff.
c. The program must have access to a wide variety of instructional materials.
d. The program cannot work in isolation and must be linked to a county wide or city wide literacy council or network.
e. Instructional approaches vary according to the needs of the learner. Some learners can handle a classroom setting while others need one-on-one tutoring.
f. Effective use of technology (e.g., CAI) can lead to more individualized instruction and the provision of services for larger numbers of adult learners.

REPLICATION

Replication

What Essential Conditions Must Agencies Meet to Replicate Successful Practices?

Deciding which conditions that programs must meet in order to replicate successful practices is difficult to address because, as the research points out, programs define "success" differently. Some programs feel they are successful if they receive continued funding, or if their enrollments are increasing or stable, while others measure the attainment of "affective" goals of learners, or job status improvement; and still others measure success based on grade-level increases in reading over a set period of time.

An additional consideration when discussing replication issues is to examine the nature of the service delivery providers themselves. This study found that there was variance, not only between the different categories of literacy providers, but also among providers in the same category. For example, within the same service delivery system (e.g., libraries), one can find differences in fiscal resources, the number of learners served, number of instructional sites, local resources available, definitions of literacy, etc. Therefore, replicating effective practices among a diverse delivery system can be difficult.

Yet, there are attributes of effective programs that this study identified that can be "replicated." That is, there are human characteristics that drive programs, like commitment, sense of mission, willingness to evaluate one's position relative to program and learner goals, and make adjustments. In the following sections, some of these characteristics will be reviewed relative to effective practices.

Material Considerations

Materials, for purposes of this section are defined as instructional materials, tests, and other related texts (e.g., training manuals), needed to operate the instructional program.

Materials (instructional text, workbooks, etc.), in and of themselves, were not the determining factor of effective practices. However, the need to select materials that are appropriate to adults and their goals was continually mentioned in the research and the telephone survey phase of the study. Also, the availability of additional materials for learners to supplement the core curriculum was recommended. It seems that programs with minimal resources can loan books from other literacy programs. The idea of cooperation among literacy providers located in the surrounding service area becomes crucial at this point. Cooperative ventures for loaning or purchasing adult books can make high quality materials available to those programs with minimal resources.

Replicating effective instructional methods is possible. However, to do this would entail training and, possibly the purchase of additional materials, depending on which instructional method one chooses. The importance of

training cannot be emphasized enough; the overwhelming majority of programs included in this study mentioned training as a very important component in their program.

The literature review and telephone survey suggest that effective programs use various teaching approaches including phonics-based instruction, whole-language approaches, and various combinations of each. If a program were to adopt or adapt new teaching methods, additional training must be considered. Teachers/tutors would need to understand, and "buy-in" to the new procedures. Further, the new procedure would need to be consistent with the program's mission or philosophy of literacy.

If the new methodology required certain texts, then they would need to be purchased, and additional training on their use would be necessary. If the new method did not necessitate commercial materials, then time would be needed to assist teachers/tutors in developing their own materials. Locally developed materials can be an asset to instructional practices. This study found, that in addition to using commercially published materials, programs did develop their own materials to suit their purposes. This could be the case for programs using the language experience approach or phonics-based approaches.

Programs wanting to use exemplary learner assessment instruments will need to decide if the assessment instrument is consistent with their program goals. If their program is learner-empowerment based, a standardized test may not be appropriate. If the program's goals are to prepare adults for job placement, then some form of criterion-referenced test based on job performance may be more suitable. If the program uses one-on-one tutoring and wants to assess changes in learners' literacy habits and goal attainment, they may want to adapt a learner-centered approach like the California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Procedure. Perhaps the program may want to emphasize and assess certain life-skills identified by the learner, then they might need a competency-based system like CASAS. The point is, the above-mentioned assessment strategies -- whether standardized or learner-centered -- can work for any program, the question is: Does the test support your program's goals and mission? If the answer is yes, then aspects of training and costs need to be considered.

Costs for assessment can be high. First of all, the test must be purchased -- on an ongoing basis. If the program is large or growing, these costs can impact other program areas. In some cases, reading specialists are hired to administer the tests to adults. If teachers/tutors administer the test, they will need to be trained. In either case, training in the use of the tests, (no matter if they are standard or learner-centered), interpreting the results, and using the results to support the instructional program are necessary components of any testing program. A record keeping system also needs to be in place -- or modifications to the existing record keeping system -- to accommodate the new outcome measures. For instance, with CASAS, a major adjustment will need to be made since this system provides for testing, record keeping and data management.

Replicating exemplary practices that involve additional costs (e.g., use

of counselors, trainers, diagnosticians, etc.) can be prohibitive for programs operating on shoestring budgets. These programs would need to actively pursue other avenues of monies to provide the services that entail additional costs. Although, it is important to note that paid staff do not necessarily insure successful outcomes. Perhaps more demands can be made on paid staff, however, developing staff commitment to the program's goals and philosophy may, in the long run, prove more beneficial.

Human Considerations

The human element in adult literacy programs is perhaps the most important resource programs have. If programs want to replicate exemplary practices, the assistance of staff is crucial. With recruitment, for example, the literature review found that adults learned about the program from friends, teachers/tutors, or generally through "word-of-mouth." The second source of recruitment of learners came from the media. Thus, in both instances, the use of people to spread the word, either in the community or over the radio or television airwaves, brought the best results for recruiting adults into the programs. Programs wishing to replicate these practices need to gather a committed staff of people who will sit and plan strategies that will use these methods to benefit their particular community. Other effective recruitment methods identified by the research included: canvassing the community, going door-to-door, handing out flyers at churches, and malls, etc.

Not surprisingly, effective programs have a good reputation in the community. Apparently, the involvement of the program staff or director, in community functions, may translate into a good working relationship with community organizations. The research recommended that programs conduct a needs assessment to include the community, in order to determine the employment needs and resources available. Programs who want to "piggy-back" on this idea will need a staff person (or the program director) to conduct this needs assessment. Information gathered will be beneficial to the program in determining community resources, needs and concerns, and also begin to build the program's reputation.

Research suggests that learners leave programs -- in many cases because of personal problems -- but they also leave if they feel their needs are not being met. Some exemplary programs referred to in this report provided counseling to learners at crucial "high-risk" periods to help keep the learner on track and in the program. Hiring a counselor may be prohibitive for programs with shoestring budgets, however, low-budget programs can train teachers to perform this activity. Programs that provide one-on-one tutoring are in an excellent position to train their tutors to "counsel" their adult learners during their individual tutoring sessions.

As mentioned earlier, the human element is the program's most important component. This study reported on the importance of the program leader. Program directors, as leaders, are the ones who bring the best of the human element out of their staff. They also build the program's reputation in the community and network with other literacy stakeholders. It is difficult to replicate leadership roles. In a sense, the old saying, "leaders are born, not made" bears some truth. However, the types of functions leaders perform

can be shared with other program directors through seminars and workshops -- perhaps sponsored by the State Department of Education. Included as participants in such seminars, however, should be leaders from all the service delivery areas, who can share their knowledge and experiences with their fellow colleagues.

Replicating successful programs is a challenge, especially since most components entail some form of training or time commitment on the part of staff. Paid staff can be counted on to attend to record keeping tasks or other staff functions, yet volunteers may have other commitments. Developing the dedication of staff to carry out the program's goals is crucial to replicating any new project. This is not to say that fiscal resources are not important, indeed they are, but focusing human energy for the good of the literacy program can prove to yield lasting results when implementing new approaches or policies.

Integrating Research-Based Models Into Existing Programs

In the review of the literature conducted for this study, it was noted that strategies that learners bring with them to the classroom are important to their subsequent learning. An understanding of these strategies can be helpful for program staff to maximize students' learning potential and eventual literacy improvement. If programs were to use this research-driven approach, they would first need to develop an instrument to identify learners' reading strategies. This instrument, or process, would elicit from learners their perception of the reading process. Many studies mentioned in this report noted that learner (and teacher) perceptions of what reading is, affects their approach to learning to read. Perhaps programs that offer one-on-one tutoring may need to consider learners' and tutors' perceptions of the reading process as another pairing or matching criteria.

Once the instrument or process has been developed, programs will need to train either a reading specialist or program staff member on how to use the instrument, how to interpret results, and how to integrate the results into the instructional setting. Ongoing staff development, to insure that the new model is being implemented, will also be necessary.

In essence, when implementing a new instructional approach, the total program needs to "buy-in" for it to be effective. The need to recognize and build on learners' reading strategies, relative to their literacy improvement, is a concept of reading that would have to be learned and embraced by all staff and teachers/tutors. Pre-conceived ideas about reading that teachers/tutors have would need to be changed through training. It is important to note that the procedures mentioned above are also relevant for ESL learners.

The andragogy model presented at the beginning of this report suggested that adults learn differently than children, and the background experiences that they bring to learning can be an asset to their literacy improvement. In order to build on learners' past experiences, programs may opt for some version of the language experience approach (DL-LEA, or content-based approach for ESL learners), or some other curriculum based on life-skills. Since

quality materials for adults are rare, using the learners' written text as a "reader" could be one answer to the materials problem. Any version of the language experience approach would need to be accompanied by supplemental materials so learners -- when ready -- can begin to read text from other authors.

As with the above section on reading strategies, programs would need to get a commitment from staff and teachers to implement this learning model. Training would need to focus, not only on the method of eliciting stories from learners, but development of materials as well. In the end, this approach may be more time-consuming since the method needs to be learned, and time is needed to develop localized materials.

In both situations presented above, staff commitment was mentioned as important to implementing any innovative method or strategy. Yet, how does a program get commitment from staff to stay longer hours to learn about a new program or devote their weekends to training sessions and workshops, or recruitment efforts? How does one do this when the teachers are part-time or volunteering their services?

The research suggests that program directors -- in their leadership role -- can be influential in guiding staff to commit themselves to the mission of the program. This study uncovered a variety of leadership traits that appear to be associated with successful programs. These traits need to be identified in context (rural, urban, CBO, library, etc.) because certain contexts will reflect different resources (e.g., paid or volunteer staff), and locations (e.g., near schools, libraries, transportation) that will require different strategies of the program leader.

Although the context may be different, some generic attributes of leaders can be identified. Keeping an open-door policy to staff, being resourceful, maintaining good relations with the community, and performing general networking functions with literacy stakeholders, are a few of the duties mentioned in the literature. Information on identifying and building these attributes can be shared with other programs through leadership institutes (perhaps similar to the SDE's ESL institute), workshops, and seminars held especially for adult educators from the different provider sectors.

Implementing research-based approaches in adult literacy programs demands more of a human effort than a fiscal one. Clearly, paid release time is important, and costs for materials is also a valid consideration, yet in the end, it's the individual who implements an innovative project -- an individual committed to the project's goals and mission.

The main requirement relative to the replication of effective methods is staff commitment. This commitment involves time given to the program to learn about new methods and approaches, and also a commitment to learning new ways of carrying out the program's goals. If programs -- for instance -- want to replicate a whole-language instructional approach to reading, then a commitment to training on this method and a commitment to <u>using</u> the method are perhaps more important than providing the actual materials. This is not to

say that materials are not important, they surely are, but if staff are not committed to using them, the best materials will remain on the bookshelves.

Also important to replication issues is the idea of cooperation among service providers. Resources that local programs lack can be obtained from others in the community. The sharing of resources can provide the opportunity for programs with less resources, to acquire the necessary prerequisites to replicate exemplary program components.

Finally, the state will need to determine how they might disseminate the resources necessary to replicate exemplary practices. There are at least two types of resources that can be disseminated: 1) materials, and 2) consultation services.

For instance, materials can be disseminated in the form of newsletters, manuals, catalogues, videos, etc. or through the 800 number, workshops, phone consultations and conferences. The cost of dissemination is dependent on the nature of the materials and the number of programs receiving the services. Existing programs can be conduits for retrieving information from exemplary programs and be responsible for disseminating data to local literacy projects. However, extra staff would need to be hired at programs providing these additional services.

As mentioned above, the state can disseminate information through the 800 number or through phone consultations regarding a specific topic or concern. The state might consider the use of an electronic bulletin board for relaying information. Many programs throughout the state are beginning to use technology and some are using the services of APPLE LINK or LIT LINE. Although, some local programs may not have the technology to "log-on" to these electronic mailboxes, other larger programs or "parent organizations" or district offices might have access to these resources, and they -- in turn -- can share information with their affiliates. Again, the idea of the network is important here. Some groups or organizations in the network might have access to telecommunications hardware, and they can act as the dissemination center for local programs, via the electronic bulletin board.

Dissemination of materials or information to programs is a fine idea, yet, in some cases, the wrong person receives the information. Program directors sometimes do not pass the information along to the person it will do the most good. On the other hand, certain information requiring a policy decision, gets into the hands of a staff person who is not responsible for such decisions. Therefore, a precise communication system that will facilitate the acquisition of information/materials to proper program personnel is essential. Further, the total literacy community should be involved in this dissemination effort. In this case, all literacy providers will have access to information about exemplary practices, (e.g., effective approaches to instruction for certain populations), and in this way, they can share ideas and resources.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Discussion of Results

The review of the literature, telephone survey, and site visits all reveal a variety of programs offering a variety of services. While information from programs and research suggest that learners should be taught using a whole-language approach, others suggest that there is a place for phonics instruction, especially for adult beginning readers. Many of the concepts deemed appropriate for English speaking learners were also found to be relevant for ESL learners, except for a few differences. The importance of the ESL learners' literacy development in the native language was an important difference, especially in relation to reading strategies acquired in the first language and their potential for transference into the second language.

With respect to international literacy efforts, teaching methods seemed to be linked with social concerns. Literacy for empowerment was the common theme among international literacy campaigns. Materials were also linked to common materials used in the learners' daily life.

As for materials in the United States, the results of this study still point to the need for materials to be adult-centered and related to learners' goals. The research shows that materials -- like teaching methods -- are linked to the program philosophy. However, to this day, authors complained of a lack of appropriate materials for both native English and ESL learners.

Most programs used tests but were not very happy with them. The results of the telephone survey revealed that learners were usually tested upon entry into the program. The choice of tests depends -- to a large extent -- on the program's philosophy of adult literacy. The research recommended that ongoing evaluation of learner progress was very important to learners' subsequent success. Similar to materials, programs used a variety of tests. Most programs mentioned that test results were usually included in state or federal reports. The research recommends that whichever tests that programs choose to use should be related to instruction and learners' goals, and results should be shared with the learner.

Program evaluation, like continual monitoring of learner progress, should be ongoing for the program to insure that it is maintaining its mission and goals. The results of this study confirm the fact that evaluation should be seen as a tool, and not a threat to program personnel. The program director should be at the forefront of the evaluation process.

The hard-to-reach illiterate adults -- both ESL and native English speaking -- usually find out about the program from friends (word-of-mouth) or through the media. Certain radio stations that cater to special ethnic populations were prime targets for PSAs, and in some instances, church Pastors were asked to help recruit potential learners.

An important finding from all facets of this study was the importance that programs placed on networking. Especially during the site-visits, the importance of networking and cooperation among the literacy service providers was emphasized.

Keeping learners in the program is still a crucial concern. The research suggested that almost half of the learners who enter literacy programs drop out. The bottom line, according to data gathered from all facets of this study, is that if learners' goals are not being met, they will "vote with their feet" and leave. Interestingly, community-based organizations were the one group who had the highest retention rates compared to libraries, ABE programs and community college programs. The research suggested that providing counseling to learners at critical "at-risk" periods and providing other interventions can work to keep retention high. The importance of the teacher/tutor was also expressed and considered crucial for keeping the learner interested in returning to the sessions.

The costs of operating the programs varies according to the nature of the delivery system. Literacy programs that have volunteer tutors do not accrue teaching costs as do ABE adult schools or community college programs. Yet, volunteer organizations need to rent space and find locations for instructional sessions, whereas adult schools and community colleges usually meet at school sites. The nature of costs also varies depending on the services that the program provides. If the program uses counselors, reading specialists, trainers, etc., then their costs increase, unless of course, these specialist volunteer their time. Effective programs seem to operate on a wide range of budgets since in the long run, their excellent use of human resources outweighs any fiscal obstacles. Even in these cases, effective programs have to be realistic about the services they can provide with limited budgets.

Finally, the role of the program director was highlighted in this study. The role varies from networker, to grant writer, to facilitator, to politician and charismatic figure. Not enough can be said about the importance of the program leader. It is this person who keeps the staff on course relative to the program's mission, and in hard fiscal times, he/she finds ways to keep the program running and staff morale high.

In sum, there is indeed a diversity of literacy providers, each enjoying various degrees of success -- which is defined by their place in the community and their learners' sense of accomplishment at attaining their individual goals. Effective programs seem to focus on process. Using materials to their learners' benefit and using methods that make sense to their learners. Effective programs assess progress based on their learners' goals -- whether they be work-related, school-related or community-related. Finally, effective programs manage the program to insure that the process of providing services to learners does not become stagnate, but changes as the goals of the learners and the community change.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations to Reduce Illiteracy in California by 1994

Recommendations to the State Department of Education will be presented in this section. The recommendations will be made based on information gathered from the three components of this study: 1) review of the literature on effective adult literacy practices, 2) the telephone survey of exemplary adult literacy programs, and 3) the site visits. The recommendations will be listed below, not necessarily in any ranked order.

Recommendations for the five year plan should:

I. Promote coordination of services among different agencies. Decrease the incidence of "turf" battles and increase recognition of the value of services provided by different agencies.

II. Promote greater sensitivity to needs and characteristics of the community (both rural and urban), and to the services available there.

III. Promote openness and accessibility among administrators and staff, through, among other things, greater shared responsibility for decision making. Involve adult learners in decisions that affect them.

IV. [Should] Not place too much emphasis on testing, per se. At the present time, effective programs use tests primarily for screening and placement. Monitoring of progress can be done in many ways.

V. [Should] Not stress specific instructional approaches or materials. Any instructional scheme that meets local needs can be effective if the administrators and staff are committed to it.

VI. Encourage programs to provide support services to help solve basic individual needs of learners. Personal counseling and knowledge of local service providers can be very helpful to learners who need more than just literacy services.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alamprese, J., Keltner, A., & Savage, K. L. (1988). The ESL teacher institute: Its impact and future. Sacramento, CA: State Department of Education.

American Library Association. (1978). Directory of literacy and adult learning programs. Chicago, IL: Author.

Anderson, R. E. & Darkenwald, C. G. (1979). Participation and persistence in American Adult Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Angus, M. A.. (1986). Native language ability and trainability in English. Paper presented to the Faculty of the School of Education. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University.

Apple Computer, Inc. (1988). Adult basic skills: Curriculum software guide. Cupertino, CA.

Appleson, M., Hammerman, M. L., & Isaacson, B. (1984). Learn to read. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 284)

Asher, J. J. (1982). Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook. Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Production Inc.

August, B., & Havrilesky, C. (1983). A youth literacy program manual. New York, NY: Literary Assistance Center, The Fund for the City of New York.

Ball, S., Bogatz, G. A., Kazarow, K. M., & Rubin, D. B. (1974). Reading with television: A follow-up evaluation of the electric company. (PR-74-15). Princeton: Educational Testing Service.

Balmuth, M. (1987). Essential characteristics of effective adult literacy programs. Albany: The State Department of Education.

Bassano, S. (1980). Consonants sound easy. San Francisco, CA: Alemany Press.

Bialo E. R., & Sivin, J. P. (1989). Computers and At-Risk Youth: Software and Hardware That Can Help. Classroom Computer Learning, pp 48-55.

Bock, L. K. (1980). Participation. In A. Knox and associates (Ed.), Developing, administering, and evaluating adult education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Boraks, N., & Richardson, J. (1981). Teaching the adult beginning readers: Designing research based reading instructional

strategies. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the College Reading Association, Louisville, KY.

Boraks, N. & Richardson, J. S. (1985). Teaching the adult beginning reader: Researched based instructional strategies. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 9(3), 131-142.

Boraks, N., & Schumacher, S. (1981). Ethnographic research on word recognition strategies of adult beginning readers: Summary report. Richmond, VA: Virginia Commonwealth University.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 990)

Bosco, J. J. (1988). Three Conclusions on Interactive Video. Adult Literacy and Technology, 2(1), pp 8-9.

Bowren, F. F. (1987). Adult reading needs adults research models. Journal of Reading, 31(3), 208-212.

Bowren, F. F., & Zintz, M. V. (1987). Teaching reading in adult basic education. Dubuque: William S. Brown.

Brown, D. A., & Newman, A. P. (1970). Research in adult literacy. Journal of Reading, Winter, 19-46.

Buchanan, B. M., & Sherman, D. C. (1981). The college reading teacher's role in higher education today. Paper presented at the European Conference on Reading, Joensuu, Finland.

CBAE Staff Development Project, San Francisco State University, & CASAS Project. (1987, March). Evaluation study report: Investing in change. Sacramento, CA: Competency Based Adult Education in California.

Caldwell, R. M., & Rizza, P. J., Jr. (1979). A Computer Based System of Reading Instruction for Adult Non-Readers. Washington, DC: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 554)

Carbo, M. (1988, November). Debunking the great phonics myth. Phi Delta Kappan, 226-240.

Carrell, P. L. (1984). Facilitating reading comprehension by teaching text structure: What the research shows. Paper presented at Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages convention, Houston, TX.

Cass, A. W. (1971). Basic education for adults. New York: Association Press.

Chall, J. S. (1989, March). Learning to read: The great debate 20 years later. Phi Delta Kappan, 521-538.

Chall, J. S., Heron, E., & Hilferty, A. (1987, November). Adult literacy: New and enduring problems. Phi Delta Kappan, 190-196.

Chisman, F. P. (1989). Jump start: The federal role in adult literacy. Project on Adult Literacy. Southport CT: Southport Institute for Policy Analysis.

Conrad, L. (1985). Semantic versus syntactic cues in listening comprehension. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7(1), 59-72.

Conseil International. (1983). Le monde de l'alphabetisation, politique recherche et action. Centre de Recherces pour le developpment International, Toronto.

Cook, W. D. (1977). Adult literacy education in the United States. Newark DE: International Reading Association.

Crandall, D. P., Lerche, R. S., & Marchilonis, B. A. (1984). Guidebook for effective literacy practice. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 776).

Cross, P. K. (1978). The missing link: Connecting adult learners to learning sources. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Crutchfield, J. E. (1981). Using LEA to improve adult reading skills. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 153)

Cummins, J. (1982). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Support and Bilingual Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education (Eds.), Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 3-50). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Darkenwald, G. G. (1975). Some effects of the "obvious variable". Teacher's race and holding power with black adult students. Sociology of Education, 48, 420-431.

Darkenwald, G. G. (1986). Adult literacy education: A review of the research and priorities for future inquiry. New York: Literacy Assistance Center.

Darkenwald, G. G., & Valentine, T. (1984). Outcomes and impact of adult basic education(Research Monograph No. 6). New Brunswick, NJ: Graduate School of Education, Rutgers-The State University, Center for Adult Development.

Darkenwald, G. G., & Valentine, T. (1985). Outcomes of participation in adult basic skills education. Lifelong Learning, 8(5), 17-31.

Darling, S. (1981). Jefferson County adult reading project final report. Louisville, KY: Kentucky State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 600)

Darling, S. (1983). Jefferson County adult reading project final report. Louisville, KY: Kentucky State Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 204 600)

DeAvila, E. A. (1984). Bilingualism, cognitive function, and language minority group membership. Unpublished manuscript.

Delker, P. V. (1984 January). State of the art in adult education. Paper presented at the National Adult Literacy Conference, Washington, D.C.

Destafano, J. S., & Abadiano, H. R. (1988). Evolving technology pie in the sky? Adult Literacy and Technology, 2(3&4), 7-8.

Devine, J. (1983). ESL Readers' internalized models of the reading process. Chicago, IL: DePaul University, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 144)

Diekhoff, G. M. (1988). An appraisal of adult literacy programs: Reading between the lines. Journal of Reading, 31, 624-630.

Diekhoff, G. M., & Diekhoff, K. B. (1984). The adult literacy program attrition problem: Identification at intake. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 8(1), 34-47.

Dusewicz, R. A., Biester, T. W., & Kenney, J. L. (1987). How to evaluate adult education. Trenton: New Jersey Department of Education.

Eggert, J. D. (1984). Concerns in establishing and maintaining a community based adult literacy project. Paper presented at the National Conference on Adult Literacy, Washington, DC.

Even, M. J. (1982). Adapting cognitive style theory in practice. Lifelong Learning, 5, 17.

Fingeret, A. (1982). Through the looking glass: Literacy as perceived by illiterate adults. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, New York, NY.

Fitzgerald, G. G. (1984, February). Can the hard-to-reach adults become literate? Lifelong Learning, 7, 4-5 27.

Fleishman, J., & Bixler, B. (1988). Hypercard: What is its

potential for adult literacy? Adult Literacy and Technology Newsletter, 2,(1), 15-16.

Forrester, A. D. (1975). Learning the language of reading. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 21, 56-62.

Forrester, A. D. (1977). What teachers can learn from natural readers. The Reading Teacher, 31, 160-166.

Forrester, A. D. (1980). Learning to spell by spelling. Theory into Practice, 19, 186-193.

Forrester, A. D. (1988). Learning to read and write at 26. Journal of Reading, 31, 604-613.

Freire, P. (1970). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Freire, P. (1974). Education for critical consciousness. New York, NY: Continuum Publishing Corporation.

Gary, J. O., & Gary, N. (1981). Comprehension-based language instruction theory. In H. Winitz (Ed). Native language and foreign language acquisition(pp. 332-342). New York: The New York Academy of Sciences.

Gillis, M. K. (1983). Effect of background information on A. B. E. readers' comprehension. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 200).

Gillis, M. K. & Longnion, B. (1982). Materials preferences and reading goals of adult beginning readers. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 6(2), 85-90.

Gold, P. C., & Johnson, J. A. (1982). Prediction of achievement in reading, self-esteem, auding, and verbal language by adult illiterates in a psychoeducational tutorial program. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 38, (3), 513-522.

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. Journal of Reading Specialist, 6(1), 126-135.

Goodman, K. S. (1979). The know-more and the know-nothing movements in reading: A personal response. Language Arts, 56(6), 657-663.

Goodman, K., Goodman, V., & Flores B. (1979). Reading in the bilingual classroom: Literacy and biliteracy. Rossly, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Goodman, Y. M., & Burke, C. L. (1972). Reading miscue inventory. New York: Macmillan.

Goudreau, N. (1986). Improve your adult literacy instruction by vitalizing research. Lifelong Learning, 10(3), 17-20.

Gough, P. B. (1976). One second of reading. In H. Singer and R. Ruddel (Eds.), Theoretical models and processes of reading, 2nd edition. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Goyen, J. D. (1989, February). Reading methods in Spain: The effect of a regular orthography. The Reading Teacher.

Grabowski, S. M. (1976, March). Educational counseling of adults. Adult Leadership, 225-227 249.

Greenleigh Associates. (1966). Field test and evaluation of selected adult basic education systems. New York, NY: Author.

Greenleigh Associates. (1969). Adult basic education in New Jersey, an evaluation of selected programs of the State Departments of Education and Community Affairs. New York, NY: Author.

Hall, M. (1981). Teaching reading as a language experience. Columbus, OH: Charles Merrill.

Hall, M., Ramig, C. and Richardson, J. (1976). A survey of adult illiterates' experience with and views of reading. A paper presented at the National Reading Conference, New Orleans, LA.

Harman, D. (1984). Functional illiteracy in the United States: Issues, experiences, and dilemmas. Prepared for the National Adult Literacy Project, San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory and the Network Inc.

Harris, J. E. (1984). The design and administrative management of literacy. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education . (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 293).

Hatch, E. (1979). Apply with caution. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 2, 123-143.

Haverson, W. W., & Haynes, J. L. (1980). Modulearn ESL literacy program: Learner workbook. San Juan Capistrano, CA: Modulearn.

Heathington, B. S. (1987). Expanding the definition of literacy for adult remedial readers. Journal of Reading, 31(2), 213-217.

Hirsch, E. P., Jr. (1983). Cultural literacy. American Scholar, 52, 159-169.

Hone, K. A. (1984, October). Serving the rural adult: Inventory of model programs. Kansas State University. Manhattan: University for

Man. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. RC 015 192)

Houle, C. O. (1964). Who stays-and why. Adult Education, _, 225-233.

Hunter, C. S. J., & Harman, D. (1979). Adult illiteracy in the United States. New York: McGraw Hill.

Hutchinson, L. F. (1978). The relationship between expressed interests and reading achievement in functionally illiterate adults. Reading Improvement, 3, 203-207.

Irish, G. (1980). Reaching the least educated adult. New Directions for Continuing Education, 39-53.

Jarvis, P. (1985). Thinking critically in an information society: A sociological analysis. Lifelong Learning: An Omnibus for Practice and Research, 8(6), 11 14.

Joag-dev, C., & Steffenson, M. (1980). Studies of the bicultural reader: Implications for teachers and librarians. (Reading Education Report #12). Urbana: University of Illinois.

Johnson, D. W. (1986, Fall). Evaluation of library literacy projects. Library Trends, 311-326.

Johnson, J. N. (1985). Adults in crisis: Illiteracy in America. Washington, D. C.: National Adult Literacy Project. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 755).

Johnson, P. (1981). Effects on reading comprehension of language complexity and cultural background of a text. TESOL Quarterly, 15, 169-181.

Jones, E. V. (1981). Reading instruction for the adult illiterate. Chicago: American Library Association.

Jones, P. L., and Petry, J. (1980). Evaluation of adult basic education in Tennessee. Memphis: Memphis State University, Tennessee College of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 204 997)

Karlstein, P. J. (1988). Fighting High School Illiteracy: The PALS Project in Brooklyn. T.H.E. Journal, IBM PC and Compatibles Special Issue, 49-54.

Kazemek, F. E. (1985). Functional literacy is not enough: Adult literacy as a development process. Journal of Reading, 9, 332-335.

Kazemek, F. E. (1988). Necessary changes: Professional involvement in adult literacy programs. Harvard Educational Review,

58(4), 464-487.

Kent, W. P. (1973). A longitudinal evaluation of the adult basic education program. Falls Church, VA: System Development Corp.

Knowles, M. S. (1978). The adult learner: A neglected species, 2nd ed. Houston, TX: Gulf.

Knowles, M. S. (1980). The modern practice of adult education, from pedagogy to andragogy. New York: Association Press.

Koen, S., & Musemeci, M. (1984). Literacy volunteers of New York City, Inc.: Summary of accomplishments. Fairfield, CT: Matrices Consulting Group.

Koen, S., Musumeci, Marilyn, Weeks, Suzanne, & Capalbo, Rosemary. (1985). Evaluating student progress: A handbook for adult literacy programs. Norwalk, CT: Matrices Consultants Inc.

Kozol, J. (1978). Children of the revolution: A Yankee teacher in Cuban schools. New York, NY: Delacorte Press.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practices in second language acquisition. New York: Pargamon Institute for English.

Lane, M. A. (1988). From print media to technology for teaching literacy: Some suggestions for bridging the gap. Adult Literacy and Technology Newsletter, 2,(3&4),3-4.

Lane, M. L., McGuire, J. F., Yeannakis, C. H., & Wurzbacher, M. F. (1984). California literacy program: Program effectiveness review. Sacramento: California State Library.

Leibert, R. E. (1983). Performance profiles of ABE students and children on an informal reading inventory. Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 4, 141-150.

Lehr, F. (1983). Adult illiteracy. Journal of Reading, 176-179.

Lewkowicz, N. K. (1987). On the question of teaching decoding skills to older students. Journal of Reading, 31(1), 50-57.

Limage, L. J. (1986). Adult literacy policy and provision in an age of austerity. International Review of Education, 32(4), 399-412.

Long, P. (1981). Adult education dropout project, 310 project evaluation report. Kansas City, MO: Kansas City School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 026)

Longfield, D. M. (1981). Passage to ESL literacy: Instructor's guide. Arlington Heights, IL: Delta Systems, Inc.

Longfield, D. M. (1984). Teaching English as a second language (ESL) to adults: State of the art. Paper presented at the National Conference on Adult Literacy, Washington DC.

Lorenzetto, A., & Karel, N. (1986). The Cuban literacy campaign. Convergence, 1(3), 46-52.

Lytle, S. L., Mormor, T. W., & Penner, F. H. (1986). Literacy theory in practice: Assessing and writing of low-literate adults. Paper presented to the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Mace, J. (1979). Working with words-literacy beyond school. London: Writers and Readers Publishing Cooperative.

Macias, R. F. (1988). Latino illiteracy in the United States. Claremont, CA: The Tomas Rivera Center.

Malicky, G., & Norman, C. A. (1982). Reading strategies of adult illiterates. Journal of Reading, 25(8), 731-735.

Mayer, S. E. (1985). Guidelines for effective adult literacy programs. Minneapolis, MN: Dalton Bookseller.

McCall, C. (1987). Women and literacy: The Cuban experience. Journal of Reading, 30(4), 318-324.

McCune, D. (1984). Increasing coordination and communication among adult literacy programs. Unpublished manuscript.

Meenan, A. L. (Ed.). (1988). Adult literacy and technology newsletter. University Park, PA: Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy 2,(3 & 4).

Meyer, V., & Keefe, D. (1980). Adult disabled readers: Their perceived models of the reading process. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 4(2), 120-124.

Meyer, V., & Keefe, D. (1985). Models of the reading process held by ABE and GED instructors. Reading Horizons, 25(8), 133-136.

Mikulecky, L. (1986). The status of literacy in our society. A paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Austin, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 281 182)

Mocker, D. W. (1975). Cooperative learning process: Shared learning experience in teaching adults to read. Journal of Reading, 18, 440-444.

Modra, H. M. (1981). Librarians for literacy. Australian Journal of Reading, 4(2), 59-65.

Mohan, B. (1988, Spring/Summer). Research within reach: Content-based language learning. Focus on Basics, 8-9.

Moulton, C. (1988). Getting tutors to use computers. Adult Literacy and Technology Newsletter, 2,(3&4), pp 2.

Mulvey, M. C. (1969). Recruitment in adult basic education, handbook. Prepared for the New England Regional Adult Education Conference, Lexington, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 030 800)

Nelson, G. L. (1987). Culture's role in reading comprehension: A schema theoretical approach. Journal of Reading, 30(5), 424-429.

Newman, A. P. (1980). Adult basic education: Reading. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Newman, A. P. (1986). An evaluation of the impact of the Advertising Council's volunteer against illiteracy campaign on public awareness of and resources devoted to adult literacy for 1985. Washington, D. C.: Coalition for Literacy.

Newman, A. P., & Eyster G. W. (1981). Checklist for evaluating adult basic education material. Journal of Reading, 701-706.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Norman, C. A. & Malicky, G. V. (1984). A comparison of two approaches for teaching reading to adults. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 8(2), 91-101.

O'Malley, J. M. , Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R. P., & Kupper L. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. TESOL Quarterly, 19(3), 557-584.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Walker, C., Russo, R. P., & Kupper, Lisa. (1987). The role of learning strategies in second language acquisition: A selected literature review (Publication No. AD-A190 967). Washington, DC: Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, U. S. Army.

Obah, T. Y. (1983). Prior knowledge and the quest for new knowledge: The third world dilemma. Journal of Reading, 27, 129-133.

Olson, J. T. (Ed.) (1985). Conference on Adult Literacy and Computers, pp 1-2.

Padak, G. M., & Padak, N. D. (1987). Guidelines and a holistic method for adult basic reading programs. Journal of Reading, 30(6), 490-496.

Pasch, M., & Oakley, N. (1985). An evaluation study of Project Learn students and tutors 1982-1984. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Patterson, O., and Pulling, L. L. (1981). Critical issues in adult literacy. In L. V. Mercier (Ed.). Outlook for the 80's: Adult literacy. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education.

Pearson, P. D., & Kamil, M. (1978, December). Basic processes and instructional practices in teaching reading. (Reading Education Report No. 7). Urbana: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois.

Pearson-Casanave, C. R. (1984). Communicative prereading activities: Schema theory in action. TESOL Quarterly, 18, 334-336.

Perkins, K., & Brutten, S. R. (1983). World frequency and contextual richness in ESL world identification. Journal of Research in Reading, 6(2), 119-128.

Phillips, J. (1984). Practical implications of recent research in reading. Foreign Language Annals, 17(4), 285-296.

Phillips, K. J., Bellorado, D., & Robinson, M. (1985). Research and development agenda. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 757)

Provus, M. (1971). Discrepancy evaluation for educational program improvement and assessment. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.

Quickel, R. L., & Wise, J. E. (1982). Final evaluation report, Horry County reading crusade Conway, SC: Horry County School District. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 221 315)

Raisner, B. (1978). Adult reading strategies: Do they differ from the strategies of children. Reading World, 18, 37-47.

Read, C., & Mackay, R. (1984). Illiteracy among adult immigrants in Canada. Montreal, QB: Concordia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 875).

Resnick, L. B., & Robinson, B. H. (1975). Motivational aspects of the literacy problem. In J. B. Carroll and J. S. Chall (Eds.). Towards a literate society(pp. 257-277). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rickard, P. (1988). Comprehensive adult student assessment system. Paper presented at the National Adult Literacy Symposium. Washington, DC: National Press Club.

Rogers, J. J. (1987). Readability as a source of perceived failure in adult literacy instruction. Lifelong Learning, 10(4), 26-29.

SRA Associates. (1987). Illiteracy in California: Needs, Services, and prospects. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Savage, K. L. (1984). Teaching strategies for developing literacy skills in non-native speakers of English. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 296)

Scribner, S., & Cole, M. (1978). Literacy without schooling: Testing for intellectual effects. Harvard Educational Review, 48, 448-461.

Smith, F. (1979). Reading without nonsense. New York: Teachers College Press of Columbia University.

Smith, F. (1982). Understanding reading. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Smith, F. (1989, January). Overselling literacy. Phi Delta Kappan, 352-359.

Smith-Burke, M. T. (1987). Starting over: Characteristics of adult literacy learners. New York, NY: New York University, Department of Educational Psychology.

Solorzano, R. W. (1988). Developing a computerized adult literacy program management system. Adult Literacy and Technology Newsletter, 2, (3&4), pp 19-20.

Solorzano, R. W., & Stecher, B. M. (1987). Study of adult learner progress evaluation practices in the California literacy campaign. Pasadena, CA: Educational Testing Service.

Solorzano, R. W., & Stecher, B. M. (1988). California Adult learner progress evaluation process phase II: Final report. Pasadena, CA: Educational Testing Service.

Staff. (1980, April). CBO's: Reaching the hardest to reach. Business Council for Effective Literacy, pp. 1 4-5.

Stauffer, J. M. (1973). The NALA study: A description of the National Affiliation for Literacy Advance. A Laubach Literacy Occasional Paper. Syracuse, NY: New Readers Press.

Stauffer, R. G. (1980). The language approach to the teaching of reading (2nd ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Sticht, T. G. (1982). Evaluation of the "reading potential"

concept for marginally literate adults. Washington, DC: Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, and Logistics).

Stockdill, S. H. (1988). The Technology for Literacy Project Evaluation Report. Minnesota: EnSearch.

Swain, M. (1979). Bilingual education: Research and its implications. In C. Yorio, K. Perkins, & J. Schachter (Eds.), On TESOL 1979: The learner in focus. Washington, DC: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Taylor, N., Wade, P., Jackson, S., Blum, I., & Goold, L. (1980). A study of low-literate adults: Personal, environmental and program considerations. Urban Review, 12(2), 69-77.

Terrell, T. D. (1982). The natural approach in bilingual education. In California State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Support and Bilingual Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education (Eds.), Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 117-146). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Thistlewaite, L. (1983). Teaching reading to the ABE student who cannot read. Lifelong Learning, 7(1), 5-7.

Thonis, E. W. (1982). Reading instruction for language minority students. In California State Department of Education, Division of Instructional Support and Bilingual Education, Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education (Eds.), Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 147-181). Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Ti-In Network. (1988) Fall 1988 program guide. San Antonio, Texas.

Towey, C. F. (1985). Quality standards for adult education programs. Washington, D. C.: Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Adult Education.

Turner, T. C. (1988). Using the computer for adult literacy instruction. Journal of Reading, 31,(7), pp 643-647.

Turner, T. (1988b). An overview of computers in adult literacy programs. Lifelong learning: An Omnibus of Practice and Research, 11,(18), 9-12.

United States Department of Education. (1988). Adult literacy: Building programs that work. Unpublished manuscript.

United States Department of Education, & United States Department of Labor. (1988). The bottom line: Basic skills in the workplace.

Washington, DC: United States Government Printing Office.

Valentine, T. (1985, April). Functional literacy and adult education. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association.

Valentine, T. (1986). Adult functional literacy as a goal of instruction. Adult Educational Quarterly, 36, 108-113.

Waite, P. A. (1984). The role of volunteers in adult literacy. Paper presented at the National Conference on Adult Literacy, Washington, DC.

Wallace, M. C. (1965). Literacy instructor's handbook. Chicago, IL: Follet

Wallerstein, N. (1984). Literacy and minority language groups: literacy as a method and goal. Paper presented at the National Conference on Adult Literacy. Washington, DC.

Wangberg, E. G., Meisner, P. M., & Busick, K. U. (1985). Adult literacy project: Development, evaluation and dissemination of interactive microcomputer software: Final Report. New Orleans, LA: University of New Orleans.

Weber, R. (1986). Dialect and adult reading instruction. Adult Literacy and Basic Education, 10(3), 138-146.

Williams, M. (1988). Cooperative efforts in urban literacy: Learnings from the urban literacy network's grant projects. Minneapolis, MN: The Urban Literacy Network.

Willing, D. C. (1989). Program evaluation as a strategy for program improvement in adult basic education. Lifelong Learning, 12(4), 4-9 23.

Wurzbacher, M. F., & Yeannakis, C. H. (1986). California literacy program: Program effectiveness review II. Sacramento: California State Library.

Young, D., & Irwin, M. (1988). Integrating computers into adult literacy programs. Journal of Reading, 31,(7), 648-652.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Exemplary Program Nomination Letter and Form
Sent to Program Directors

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PASADENA OFFICE

2 North Lake Avenue
Suite #510
Pasadena, California 91101
818 578-1971

Frank S. Romero
Director

December 13, 1988

Dear Adult Literacy Service Provider:

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) Pasadena Field Office has been awarded a contract by the California State Department of Education to study the characteristics of exemplary adult literacy programs in California. The purpose of the study is to identify and examine characteristics of successful adult literacy programs and share the results with adult literacy service providers in California. To begin the first phase of this project, ETS will identify potential exemplary programs for inclusion in the study.

Is your adult literacy program a model for others to follow? If so, we want to know. We realize that there are over 1,000 literacy service providers in the State of California, including community colleges, adult schools, community based organizations (CBOs) and public libraries. It is not possible to conduct extensive reviews of all these programs, but it would be unfortunate to omit a promising project simply because the total number of service providers is so large.

Therefore, ETS would like to extend to local literacy programs the opportunity to nominate themselves -- or another program they know of -- for consideration as an exemplary project. ETS will review data from the respondents with the California Department of Education staff and the Project Advisory Committee to form the pool for further in-depth study.

What do we mean by exemplary? By exemplary we mean that the program is successfully improving the literacy skills (reading and writing) of learners and addressing learners' needs and goals.

What characteristics do exemplary programs have? To assist us in identifying effective program components, we have consulted the literature on adult education, practitioners in adult education programs, the California Department of Education (Adult Education Unit), and our own adult literacy background, and identified eight characteristics that have been found to be associated with successful adult literacy programs.

If your program is successfully improving learners' literacy skills and excels in two or more of the areas listed below, we would like to know. Complete the Exemplary Program Nomination Form (attached) and return it to us by December 30. Please refer to the program areas below when making your decision to submit your program's name for nomination in the study. Since this list may not be complete, please feel free to add any other outcome measures that you feel are important.

Exemplary Program Areas

Learner Outcomes

Your program has been successful in helping learners improve their literacy levels and reach their goals and your program maintains supporting documentation in this area.

Instruction

Your program's curriculum and teaching methods meet the needs/goals of the learners and you keep supporting records.

Training

Program provides ongoing training for teachers/tutors to implement program's instructional philosophy.

Services to Non-English Speaking Learners

Your program addresses the needs of non-English speaking learners through the use of appropriate teaching and assessment materials which are geared towards this learner population. Recruitment efforts are directed to these learners as well.

Testing and Evaluation

Your program has a mechanism for ongoing monitoring of learner progress, and this evaluation of learner progress is linked to instruction. In addition, your program has been evaluated within the last three years.

Outreach and Recruitment

Your program has a successful plan for recruiting "hard-to-reach" adults.

Learner Retention

Your program has incentives for learners to stay in the program and, as a result, your program has a low learner attrition rate.

Program Management

Your program efficiently allocates human resources (e.g., volunteer and paid staff) and fiscal resources (e.g., monies for materials for English speaking and/or non-English speaking learners, or monies for other program components like recruitment or advertising).

If your program is selected for the study, ETS will contact you in the near future to discuss -- in greater detail -- aspects of your program and how they relate to the program components described above.

We appreciate you taking the time to respond to this letter. If you have any questions, please call us at (818) 578-1971.

Sincerely,

R. W. Solorzano

Ronald W. Solorzano
Project Director

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM NOMINATION FORM

Please complete the following information and mail it to: Ronald W. Solorzano, Project Director. ETS, 2 North Lake Avenue, Suite 510 Pasadena, California 91101 by December 30.

_____Yes, I would like to nominate our program for the California State Department of Education study.

____ I would like to nominate another program for the study.

Name of program_____ Name of program _____

Contact person _____ Contact person _____

Street address _____ Street address _____

City/ZIP code _____ City/ZIP code _____

Phone number _____ Phone number_____

Background Information

Which statement below best describes the program you are nominating?

___ Adult Basic Education

___ Community College program offering credit and noncredit classes in adult education

___ Library based adult literacy program

___ Community based organization (CBO)

___ Other _____

Please check the areas in which you consider the program to be exemplary and indicate why you think the program is exemplary in these areas. Finally, indicate the nature of the data you have to support your view.

__ Learner Outcomes: **Why is program exemplary in this area?**_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Instruction: **Why is program exemplary in this area?**_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

(over)

__ Training: Why is program exemplary in this area? _____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Services to non-English speaking learners: Why is program exemplary in this area?

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Testing and Evaluation: Why is program exemplary in this area?_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Outreach and Recruitment: Why is program exemplary in this area?_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Learner Retention: Why is program exemplary in this area?_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Program Management: Why is program exemplary in this area?_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

__ Other:(please describe) _____

Why is program exemplary in this area?_____

_____

Supporting evidence _____

If you have an evaluation or report to support your nomination, please send us a copy. Thank You.

APPENDIX II

Exemplary Program Nomination Letter and Form
Sent to Experts in the Field

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE (ETS) PASADENA OFFICE

2 North Lake Avenue
Suite #510
Pasadena, California 91101
818 578-1971

Frank S. Romero
Director

December 13, 1988

Dear Colleague:

Educational Testing Service (ETS), Pasadena Field Office, is conducting a study of exemplary adult literacy programs for the California State Department of Education (Adult Education Unit). The purpose of the study is to identify exemplary adult literacy programs, examine their characteristics, identify the necessary prerequisites for replication of these successful program elements among the various service delivery sectors (e.g., adult schools, community colleges, libraries, community based organizations), and make recommendations for developing a plan to reduce illiteracy in California by the year 1994.

As one who is familiar with adult literacy, we would appreciate your input during this phase of the project. Do you know of any exemplary adult literacy projects? These projects can be located in California or nationwide.

What do we mean be exemplary? Does the program have a high success rate of improving learners' literacy skills (e.g., reading and writing). Is the program meeting learners' needs and helping them meet their goals?

If you know of any programs that are successfully improving learners' literacy skills, please list the program on the nomination page on the attached sheet. Please return this sheet to us by December 30. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (818) 578-1971.

Thank You,

R. W. Solorzano

Ronald W. Solorzano, Ph.D.
Project Director

EXEMPLARY PROGRAM NOMINATION FORM

I would like to recommend the following exemplary adult literacy program(s) for your study:

Name of Program _____

Street Address _____

City/State _____

Phone Number _____

Contact Person _____

Reason for referral _____

_____

_____

Name of Program _____

Street Address _____

City/State _____

Phone Number _____

Contact Person _____

Reason for referral _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX III

Letter to Selected Programs
Explaining Telephone Survey

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE PASADENA OFFICE

2 North Lake Avenue
Suite #510
Pasadena, California 91101
818 578-1971

Frank S. Rometo
Director

Dear Project Director,

Your efforts to help adults improve their reading and writing skills have been noticed. A member of our panel of literacy experts recommended that your program be included in our study of exemplary literacy programs. We would like to congratulate you for your success and learn more about the elements that make your program work.

I would like to request an hour or so of your time to talk about your program. A member of the ETS Literacy Study Team will be calling you to gather information about the elements that contribute to your project's success in reducing adult illiteracy. The study is designed to identify important elements of exemplary programs, so these strategies can be incorporated into future program development efforts by the Department of Education. The results of our study will be used to develop guidelines for a five-year effort to reduce illiteracy in the state.

We will be asking questions about the following topics:

1. Program Size: How many learners and instructors are involved in the program and how many hours of instruction are provided?

2. Types of Learners: What language groups does your program serve, and what type of learners (participants in job training programs, welfare recipients, etc.)?

3. Program Goals: What are primary goals of the project (basic skills, ESL, workplace literacy, family literacy, GED preparation, etc.)? Do program goals differ for different groups of adults?

4. Learners' Goals: What are the principle reasons that learners participate in your program (GAIN requirements, general desire to learn to read, part of an employment training program, to learn English as a second language, etc.)? What kinds of learning objectives do participants pursue?

5. Instructional Approach: Does your program use a particular approach to teaching (language experience, phonetics, competency-based curriculum, etc.)? How are instructional methods selected?

6. Curriculum and Instructional Materials: Does your program have a specific curriculum? Which instructional materials are used (textbooks, workbooks, disk-based software, videodiscs, etc. -- which specific titles and publishers)?

7. Student Testing: Do you conduct diagnostic testing? Are tests used to place learners in instructional groups or to monitor learner progress? What other student assessment occurs (types of indicators, frequency of use, etc.)?

8. Program Evaluation: How do you determine the success of your program? Has your program ever been formally evaluated?

9. Recruitment: What outreach and recruitment strategies does your program use?

10. Support Services: What support services are provided to assist students?

11. Learner Retention: Does the program have specific methods or incentives to encourage learners to remain until completion?

12. Instructors: Does the program use volunteer or paid instructors? What background and experience do instructors have? Do they receive additional training?

13. Student Records: What kind of information about learners is maintained and how is this information used?

14. Program Management: What is the program's annual budget? How are funds and personnel managed? What management qualities are essential to program success?

15. Success Factors: What are the most important elements in your projects success? Were there any special problems that the program had to overcome to achieve its success? How easily could others duplicate your efforts in other locations?

Please think about these questions and gather any information you may need to respond to our phone call. The conversation should last about an hour. We will also be asking you to send us copies of program reports and evaluations.

After completing the telephone survey we will visit a small number of sites in person. This will give us an opportunity to learn more about how these projects achieve their success, and it will also allow us to thank the staff in person for their cooperation.

Let me thank you now for taking the time to prepare for our conversation about your project.

Sincerely,

Ron Solorzano

Ron Solorzano
Project Director

APPENDIX IV

Telephone Interiew Guide

Reducing Illiteracy Telephone Interview Guide
1/28/89

Respondent:_____ Date: _____

Program Name:_____ Location:_____

Telephone Number:_____ Interviewer: _____

Interview Start Time:_____ am/pm Call Back: _____

[Greeting:] "Hello, my name is _____, and I am calling from Educational Testing Service to ask you some questions about your literacy program. We sent you a letter describing the purposes of the study and the way the results are going to be used, so I won't spend a lot of time repeating all the background information. However, if you have any questions about the study, please feel free to ask me.

If not, I will get right into the interview. It should take about an hour. I'll try to follow the same order as the written outline you received in the mail. If there are additional things I should know to understand your program and the reasons for its effectiveness, please tell me about them.

[Opening Questions:] "Let me begin by asking for some general information about the size of the program and the types of learners you serve:"

1. Program Size

A. How many learners are served by your program at the present time? _____

During the past (academic/calendar) year? _____

In a typical month? _____

B. How many paid instructors work in the program at the present time? _____ How many volunteers? _____

During the past year? _____ _____

In a typical month? _____ _____

C. How many hours of instruction are provided:

In a typical week? _____ [ask all that apply]
During the past year? _____

D. How many hours of instruction are completed by the typical adult learner in your program?

_____

E. Approximately what percentage of the learners remain in the program for less than 50 hours of instruction? _____ %
between 50 and 100 hours? _____ %
between 100 and 150 hours? _____ %
between 150 and 200 hours? _____ %
more than 200 hours? _____ %

F. Are there other, non-teaching personnel who are important to the program?

___ Yes
___ No

If yes, how many and what are their jobs?

Job	Number
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

2. Types of Learners

A. What are the primary languages spoken by the adults served by your program? Please indicate the percent in each group.

___ English
___ Spanish
___ Mandarin
___ Chinese
___ Vietnamese
___ Other (Specify _____)
___ Other (Specify _____)

B. What percent of the learners who enroll in your program are:

___ GAIN/welfare participants
___ JTPA participants
___ Regularly enrolled ABE students
___ Regularly enrolled community college students
___ Individuals who seek out the program for their own purposes
___ Other (Specify _____)

C. What are the reading levels of the adults served by your program? Please estimate the percent of program participants that are in each group:

%	
___	0 - 4th grade level
___	5th - 8th grade level
___	9th - 12th grade level
___	above 12th grade level

D. Does your program normally measure reading ability in grade level terms? ____ Yes ____ No

E. What tests do you use to measure reading level?_____

[Questions on Program Goals:] "Now, I would like some information about the program's goals, and the goals of the learners."

3. Program Goals

A. What are your program's most important goals?

_____

_____

_____

[reference list for interviewer:]
__ Basic Skills Education
__ English as a Second Language (ESL)
__ GED Preparation
__ Employment/Job Training
__ Family Literacy
__ Vocational Education
__ Workplace Literacy
__ Other. Please describe:_____

B. How were the goals determined? _____

_____

_____

C. Does your program have a specific definition of literacy?

___ Yes If yes, what is it? _____
___ No

_____

D. [If relevant] Are there different overall program goals for different groups of participants (e.g., English speaking adults and Non-English speaking adults, those in job training program and those not in job training programs, adults from different racial/ethnic groups, etc.)?

__ Yes If yes, please clarify:
__ No

Group	Primary Program Goals
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

E. Have the program's goals changed in the past few years?

__ Yes If yes, please explain _____
__ No

_____

If yes, why did they change?

_____

4. Learner Goals

A. Why do learners participate in your program? (What are their principal reasons?)

_____

_____

(Check all that apply.)

___ GAIN/welfare requirements
___ JTPA requirements
___ Part of broader job training program
___ Desire to obtain GED
___ Desire to learn English
___ Desire for employment improvement
___ Desire to improve literacy skills for personal reasons
___ Referred from other agency
___ Referred from job
___ Other (Specify _____)

B. How do you know this information? _____

_____

C. Does the program establish specific learning objectives for each learner?

___ Yes If yes, how are they developed? _____
___ No

_____

_____

If yes, how are objectives stated (measurable terms)?

_____

_____

D. Do you collect information about whether learners achieve their objectives?

___ Yes If yes, what information _____
___ No

_____

_____

[**Instructional Methods and Materials**:] "Thank you for describing the program's goals and objectives. Now I want to ask you some questions about the specific instructional methods and materials you use."

5. Instructional Approach

A. Does your program have a particular instructional method or approach?

___ Yes If yes, how would you describe it:_____
___ No

_____

(Check all that apply if specifically mentioned.)

___ Language Experience
___ Phonics
___ Programmed instruction
___ Laubach Literacy Action methods
___ Literacy Volunteer of America methods
___ Computer Assisted Instruction
___ Competency-based education
___ Other (Specify_____)

If yes, how were these methods/approaches selected? _____

_____

B. How is instruction provided? Is it primarily:

___ One on one?
___ Small group (3 - 10 students)?
___ Intermediate groups (11 - 20 students)?
___ Large groups (21 or more students)?

C. Are different instructional methods/approaches used with different groups (e.g., English speaking adults and Non-English speaking adults, those in job training program and those not in job training programs, adults from different racial/ethnic groups, etc.)?

___ Yes If yes, which groups and methods:
___ No

Group	Method
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

D. How are instructional methods/approaches selected to meet the needs of the groups you serve?

_____

_____

6. Curriculum and Instructional Materials

A. Does your program have a written curriculum?

___ Yes If yes, please describe_____
___ No

_____

B. How often is the curriculum reviewed and/or revised?

_____

_____

C. What kinds of instructional materials do you use?

	Which ones? (Authors, Publishers or Titles):
___ Textbooks	_____
___ Workbooks	_____
___ Software	_____
___ Videodiscs	_____
___ Work manuals	_____
___ Other	_____

C. How many of these materials were designed to be used with adults?

___ All ___ Most ___ Some ___ None

Describe: _____

_____

D. How are materials selected?

_____

_____

F. Are different materials used with different groups (e.g., English speaking adults and Non-English speaking adults, those in job training program and those not in job training programs, adults from different racial/ethnic groups, etc.)?

___ Yes If yes, please indicate
___ No

Group	Instructional Materials
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
	_____

[Testing and Evaluation:] "We are particularly interested in the way you use tests and assessment and whether or not you evaluate your program."

7. Student Testing

A. What tests and/or assessments do you use? Why?

Test	Purpose
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

[Probe: Some programs use tests for:
Do you test for this purpose?
screening/admissions
monitoring student progress
certifying completion
grading
referrals
choosing curriculum]

B. [Follow up, as appropriate]: Does your program conduct diagnostic assessment or placement testing of new participants?

___ Yes
___ No

If yes, what skills and abilities are measured?

_____

What tests are used?

_____

Who does the testing?

_____

What are their qualifications?

_____

When does testing occur?

_____

How long is the average testing time for a student?

_____

C. Are test scores shared with students?

___ Yes If yes, how do students use the information?
___ No

_____

_____

_____

D. Have you used other tests or assessment devices in the past?

___ Yes If yes, which tests? _____
___ No

_____

If yes, why did you stop? _____

_____

8. Program Evaluation

A. How do you determine the success of your program?

_____

_____

[Probe and/or check those that are mentioned.]

___ Grade level increases in reading
___ GED passing rates
___ Course completion rates
___ Enrollment increases
___ Increases in the number of staff
___ Job placement rates
___ Continuing enrollment (retention)
___ Competency mastery rates
___ Changes in learner self-concept
___ Post-test scores on standardized test (_____ test)
[Note specific criteria as mentioned.]
__ reading at the ____ grade level
__ passing GED examination
__ scoring at the ____ CASAS level
__ enrolling in ABE program
__ finding a job
__ other (Specify _____)
___ Other. Please describe: _____

B. Are you required to report to any agency or organization (e.g. a funding source)?

___ Yes If yes, what information do they require? _____

___ No

_____

C. [As needed]: Do you gather information to determine if program goals have been met?

___ Yes If yes, what data do you collect, how often, and

___ No how do you use it?

What data?	How often?	How used?
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

D. [As needed]: Who do you ask to find out if your program is successful? What do you learn from each group? (Describe all that apply.)

	Group	Information Collected
___	Instructors	_____
___	Other Staff	_____
___	Graduates	_____
___	"Leavers"	_____
___	Community groups	_____
___	Other agencies	_____
___	Other (_____)	_____

E. Has your program ever been formally evaluated?

___ Yes If yes, please explain when, by whom, and what results?

___ No

_____

_____

_____

If yes, did the evaluation lead to any changes in the program?

___ Yes If yes, please describe _____
___ No

_____

_____

F. Do you have a specific budget for evaluation?

___ Yes If yes, please describe _____
___ No

_____

G. Will you please send us a copy of any reports of program success or any program evaluations?

___ Yes, the following reports will be sent:_____
___ No

[Recruitment, Support Services, and Learner Retention:] "My next set of questions deals with recruitment activities, support services and learner retention."

9. Recruitment

A. How do students find out about your program?

_____

_____

_____

___ Flyers [Check all that apply, and describe below.]
___ Door to door canvassing
___ Advertisements in newspapers or magazines
___ Articles in newspapers or magazines
___ Toll free (800) phone number
___ Radio advertisements
___ TV advertisements
___ Catalogues
___ Word of mouth
___ Alumni and graduates of the program
___ Marketing research
___ Co-sponsoring classes with other organizations
___ Referrals from other programs/agencies (Describe: _____

_____

___ Other_____

B. What strategies have been most effective in promoting your program among adults who are difficult to recruit?

_____

_____

_____

C. Do different recruitment strategies work better with different groups of learners?

___ Yes If yes, please describe learners and strategies:
___ No

Learners	Strategies
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

D. How were these strategies developed? _____

_____

_____

E. Do you gather information to find out if you are reaching your target populations?

___ Yes If yes, what information?_____
___ No

How obtained?_____

How often?_____

10. Support Services

A. What services (in addition to literacy instruction) do you provide to encourage adults to remain in the program?

_____

_____

_____

[Probe, and check as appropriate from list on next page]:

___ Personal counseling
___ Academic counseling
___ Career counseling
___ Child care
___ Transportation
___ Job placement and referral
___ Other (Specify _____)
___ Other (Specify _____

B. What percentage of your instruction is offered in the daytime, in the evening?

___% Daytime ___% Evening

C. Why do you schedule instruction in this manner?

_____

_____

D. In how many locations are classes held? _____

Where? _____

E. How do you determine the locations? _____

_____

F. Do you work with other agencies to provide supplemental student services?

___ Yes If yes, describe _____
___ No

G. Does your program use volunteers to provide any services?

___ Yes If yes, describe duties of volunteers: _____
___ No

_____

_____

11. Learner Retention

A. What are the principal reasons that learners leave your program?

_____

_____

[Probe, or check as many as apply from list on next page]

____ Achieved program's criteria for success (Specify _____

____ Work change
____ Met individual literacy goals
____ Found employment
____ Moved
____ Incarcerated
____ Referred to other program
____ Unknown reasons
____ Other (Specify_____)

How do you know about reasons for leaving? _____

_____

B. Do you have any information about the retention or attrition rates of learners in the program? (For example, do you know what percentage of the adults who start the program complete it? or what percentage leave prior to completion?)

___ Yes If yes, describe:_____
___ No

_____

[Instructors:] "We've talked a lot about your students. I would like to ask a few questions about the instructors who work in your program."

12. Instructors

A. How do you find instructors for the program? _____

_____

B. What percentage of instructors are:

%

___ Certificated/licensed teachers (community college credentials)
___ Certificated/licensed teachers (K-12)
___ Certificated/licensed teachers (Adult education)
___ Non-certificated staff, with teaching experience
___ Non-certificated staff, with little or no teaching experience
___ Other (Specify _____)

C. What other qualifications do you look for in instructors?_____

_____

D. What percentage of the instructors are volunteers? _____ %

E. Does the program provide training or staff development for instructors?

___ Yes If yes, what is the nature of the training_____
___ No

_____

Who provides the training? What are their qualifications?

_____

_____

What percent of total budget is for training?_____

_____

How are training topics determined?_____

_____

Do you have specific goals and objectives for staff development?

___ Yes If yes, describe_____
___ No

_____

How are goal established? (e.g., needs assessment, derived from program goals, curriculum or mission statements, etc.)

_____

_____

What percentage of teachers are trained? ___ %
How much training per teacher (on average)? ___ hrs
How long does training last (on average)? ___ hrs

How do you know the training is being used? _____

_____

[Record Keeping and Management:] I know this has been a long interview, and I appreciate the time you have taken. I have just a few more topics left to discuss. First, I want some information about your record keeping system."

13. Student Records

A. What kinds of information do you keep about the adult learners in your program?

_____

_____

[Probe or check all that apply on following page.]

___ Attendance
___ Background information
___ Placement data
___ Lesson completion data
___ Competency/objective completion data
___ Test scores
___ Course grades
___ Anecdotal data (notes, reports, etc.)
___ Other (Please specify)

_____

B. Who collects the information? Is it updated regularly?

_____

_____

C. In what form is the information maintained?

___ Paper files stored in the office
___ Paper files retained by instructors
___ Computerized student record keeping systems (e.g., LITMUS, PLATO, etc.)
___ Other (Specify _____)

D. How is the information used (e.g. are student records used in instructional planning, counseling or other program activities)?

___ Yes If yes, which data, how used?_____
___ No

_____

_____

[Program Management:] "Next, I would like to ask some questions about program management, both fiscal and personnel management."

14. Program Management

A. What is the annual budget for the program? $ _____

B. What are the sources of the funds?

State allocation $_____ (Describe specific program sources:

_____ ABE
_____ Library
_____ Education
_____ Other
(Specify_____)

City funding $_____
IRCA $_____ (Immigration reform; "amnesty")
JTPA $_____ (Job training partnership act)
GAIN $_____ (Greater avenues for independence)
Federal funds $_____ (Describe _____)

Foundation grants $_____ (Describe _____)

Corporate funds $_____ (Describe _____)

Local fund raising $_____ (Describe _____)

Other $_____ (Describe _____)

C. What is the cost per service-unit of conducting your program (e.g., per pupil, per instructor or per instructional hour)?

$___ per pupil (i.e., total budget divided by number of students)
$___ per instructor (total budget divided by number of instructors)
$___ per instructional hour (total budget divided by hours)
$___ per other measure (Specify _____)

D. What special activities have you conducted to increase funding for your program (e.g., fund raising activities, walk-a-thons, etc.)?

_____

_____

E. How do you decide how funds will be used? _____

_____

F. How do individual teachers and support staff obtain materials, equipment, etc.?

_____

_____

G. Do teachers receive an allocation they can spend for instructional equipment and/or activities?

___ Yes If yes, how much money do they receive?_____
___ No

_____

If yes, how do they decide how to spend the funds?_____

_____

H. Do you feel there are any special management practices that contribute to the success of the program?

___ Yes If yes, describe_____
___ No

_____

[Success and Replication:] "Finally, I would like to know what you consider to be the most important reasons for the success of your program, and whether it could be duplicated elsewhere."

15. Success Factors

A. If another group wanted to create a program like yours, what would be the most important things they would need to do to achieve similar success?

_____

_____

_____

B. Are there any special conditions or circumstances in your area that they might not be able to find in their location?

___ Yes If yes, describe _____
___ No

_____

_____

[Conclusion]: I want to thank you for taking the time to talk with me today. The Adult Education Unit is very interested in understanding successful programs so these strategies can be disseminated to other literacy service providers.

We are going to review the information you provided along with the results of conversations with other service providers to look for ways to serve the growing population of functionally illiterate adults in California. Unfortunately we cannot see all the programs first hand, but we are going to select a small number for site visits. If we are able to visit your program in person who should we call to get approval and to make arrangements?

Name:_____ Phone:_____

Again, thank you very much for your assistance. You indicated you could send us _____ (evaluation report, etc.). Please send the information to: ETS 2 N. Lake Ave. Suite 510, Pasadena, CA 91101, Attn: RS.

Interview Completion Time:_____ am/pm

What was your general impression of the interview?

___ Excellent ___ Good ___ Fair ___ Poor

Additional notes: _____

_____

APPENDIX V

Site Visit Protocol

Site Visit Guidelines
Reducing Illiteracy in California

Purpose: We are conducting site visits to confirm our initial impressions about effective program components and increase our understanding of the manner in which programs achieve their success. While our questions during the site visits will address the same issues as the telephone interviews, the site visits expand on the phone contacts in a number of ways:

. We obtain first-hand experience with the programs to correct/solidify our second-hand impressions.

. We probe more deeply and follow-up on areas of interest.

. We talk with additional staff and with adult learners to obtain other perspectives about program operations.

Prior to the site visit, please review the telephone interview and note any areas that need clarification. Contact the program director and request an opportunity to speak with instructors and/or specialists, and with one or two adult learners.

Areas of Interest:

Our primary concerns are still effective program components and their replicability. The site visits provide a good opportunity to address these issues in depth. They also offer an opportunity to probe more deeply into the connections between the program and other local agencies that provide education and social services. The major topics you might want to address are:

1. Program Goals
2. Adult Learner Goals
3. Instructional Approach and Materials
4. Student Assessment and Program Evaluation
5. Recruitment and Retention
6. Staffing and Staff Development
7. Success Factors and Replicability

In addition, you may want to confirm the information we gathered regarding:

1. Type and number of students
2. Levels of service provided
3. Number and background of staff
4. Funding

Sample Opening Questions:

Program Goals: You indicated that your program's most important goals were _____. Is that correct?

How do these goals get translated into services?
What are the most important things you do to achieve these goals?
Are there other agencies in the area that have similar goals, and, if so, how do you coordinate services?

Learner Goals: You told us that the adults served by your program are primarily interested in _____. Is that an accurate description?

What do you do to address these concerns?
Is there anything unique about the goals of the learners you serve that would not be found elsewhere?
What are the greatest problems you face in meeting the needs of these learners?

Instructional Methods and Materials: Our notes indicate that the primary method for delivering instruction is _____, and that the materials used most often are _____. Is this accurate?

Why do you use this approach and these materials?
How important are the approaches and materials to the program's success?
Is there something special about the adults you serve that makes these materials and methods effective?
Would you recommend these approaches and materials to other programs?

Student Assessment and Program Evaluation: You indicated that the following tests were used with adult learners _____, and that you judged the success of your program on the basis of _____. Is this an accurate summary?

How important is testing to the program?
How do the teachers and adult learners feel about the tests?
Are you satisfied with you ability to judge the success of the program?
What other things would you like to be able to know?
Are there any testing or evaluation recommendations you would make to other literacy programs?

Recruitment and Retention: In the telephone interview you said that students learn about your program through _____. Is this correct?

Would you recommend these approaches to other literacy programs?
Do you coordinate your recruitment with other agencies?

You said the program provided some special support services, such as _____. Did we summarize this correctly?

How important are these services to the adults in your program?
What other services would make a significant difference to adults?
Would you recommend that other program provide such services?
Are these features available from other agencies?

You estimated the retention rate to be _____. Do you think this is an accurate estimate?

What have you tried to do to keep people from dropping out of the program?
Are there other organizations in the local area that could help?
What other steps have you considered?
What would you recommend that other programs do to reduce attrition?

Staffing and Staff Development: You said that the staff had the following qualifications _____, and that you provided certain staff development/training activities _____. Have I summarized this correctly?

Which are the most important qualifications for staff members?
Do you staff have special qualities that make them successful that might not be found in other people or other places?
How important is training to the success of your program?
What staff development activities have been the most effective?
How would you recommend other program do to improve their staff?

Success Features and Replicability:

What makes this program work well for you/the adults who come here?
What are the strengths of this program?
What should someone try to copy if they were going to start an adult literacy program somewhere else?
How well does this program meet your needs?
What would you change about the program if you could?

<u>For Instructors and Adult Learners</u>:

Any of the above questions that seem appropriate, particularly those relating to success factors and replicability.

APPENDIX VI

List of Project
Statewide Advisory Committee

Reducing Illiteracy in California
Project Statewide Advisory Committee

Pat Rickard, Director
CASAS

Juanita Stanley, Executive Director
California Literacy Inc.

Richard Bell, Executive Director
Literacy Volunteers of America-California

Carrie Haynes
Assault on Illiteracy

Virginia Rafleson, Director
Basic Adult Spanish Education

Al Bennett, Literacy Specialist
California State Library

James Figueroa, Director
Adult Education, LAUSD

Don McColm, Director
Adult School
Fresno Unified School District

Rita Cepeda, Dean Assessment & Evaluation
Office of the Chancellor, Community Colleges

Dr. Reynaldo Macias, Professor
University Southern California

Angela Yang, Supervisor Outreach Librarian
San Diego Public Library

Barbara Clark, Administrative Principal Librarian
Los Angeles Public Library

Dr. Carole Talan, Director
Project "Second Chance"
Contra Costa Country Library

Dr. Diane Vines, Director
Special Projects
The California State University, Office of the Chancellor

Gary Tom
San Francisco Community College

APPENDIX VII

List of Successful Adult Literacy Programs

Reducing Illiteracy in California
List of Selected Programs for Telephone Interview

1. Program Name:
Jefferson County Adult Learning Program

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Murray, Kentucky

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide reading skills and basic skills education. Primary goals are determined by State mandate. The program defines literacy as an individual reading above the 6th grade level.

Nature of Program:
Instructors collect information on curriculum to determine program success, additionally, student satisfaction with program is also indicative of success. Other indicators are grade level increases in reading, post-test scores on standardized test (Slosson Oral Reading Test/Test of Adult Basic Education). Program has been formally evaluated by the National Diffusion Network.

2. Program Name:
Adult Basic Education of Richland

Program Type:
Adult Basic Education

Location:
Richland; Columbia, South Carolina

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Goals are determined by State mandate to provide Basic Skills Education for learners. Program definition of literacy relates to individuals who have skill differences that hinder them in the labor market.

Nature of Program:
In order to determine program success, instructors collect information on curriculum and program operations; graduates evaluate teachers, location of program, and time of classes; and businesses evaluate student abilities in the workplace. Also, competency mastery rates are used as an indicator of success.

3. Program Name:
Technology for Literacy Center

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Saint Paul, Minnesota

Program Goals/Philosophy:
"Project" funded for 3 years, however Technology for Literacy Center started in 1985 and continues. Project also included research incentive grants. Goals for the program are to provide basic skills education and improve literacy skills for adults in St. Paul. Overall goals were determined through a one year planning process utilizing an Advisory Board, schools, etc. The program definition of literacy is to function effectively in St. Paul. Overall, the program focus is on individual goals.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by grade level increases, continuing enrollment (retention), competency mastery rates, and continuing funding. Formal evaluations of the program are formative, summative, and cost-effective and conducted by independent evaluators. Program has had very good results.

4. Program Name:
Literacy for Every Adult Program (LEAP)

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Richmond, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program goals are to provide job-seeking adults improvement in reading and writing skills, and in self-concept. Furthermore, program goals are to provide improvement in basic skills education, and employment. Overall goals evolved over five years within framework of California Literacy Campaign. Experience with adults has broadened their focus. Program defines literacy as a whole language approach speaking, writing, reading, and listening. Program goals differ in respect to native-English speakers, whereas, non-English speakers need to learn to communicate in English.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by enrollment increases (referrals from student to others, changes in learner self-concept. Other indicators of success are subjective and anecdotal, such as student attitudes about themselves. A formal evaluation was done in 1984, the results were that technology has great value in adult literacy and the program has a good community focus.

5. Program Name:
Youth for Service

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
San Francisco, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Primary role of the program is to equip people to function in their lives; in employment/job training, family literacy, and enhance self-esteem and self-concept. Job application is part of Principle of the Alphabet Literacy System (PALS). The program's specific definition of literacy is: Literacy to function in society and to move on to other programs.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by grade level increases in reading, changes in learner self-concept, and if the students have met their goals. Other indicators are 2-3 year gain in learning level and to feel comfortable with computers and typing. PALS has been formally evaluated.

6. Program Name:
Jamaica Plain Community Schools

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Primary mission of program is to improve basic communications skills and promote community development. Also, the program provides basic skills education, English as a Second Language (ESL), General Education Development (GED) preparation, employment/job training, and vocational education. Program goals are determined by community needs. In program post-test literacy is not used -- the word learning is used.

Nature of Program:
To determine if the program is successful information is collected from: instructors concerning class size, effectiveness of curriculum, methods of instruction; from other staff/administrators concerning program effectiveness; information from other agencies; and from current students. Other factors taken into consideration for overall program success are: grade level increases in reading, GED passing rates, course completion rates, enrollment increases, increases in the number of staff, job placement rates, continuing enrollment, competency in mastery rates, changes in learner self-concept, and post test scores (Adult

Basic Learning Examination). The program was formally evaluated in Spring of 1986 by Adult Learning Resource Institute.

7. Program Name:
Adult Literacy Network

Program Type:
Network

Location:
San Diego, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the Network are made up of independent providers to enable adults to use printed and written material to function in their daily lives. Overall program goals are determined by Network subcommittee.

Nature of Program:
The success of the Network is determined by the number of new programs, number of calls to 1-800 telephone number, and number of new learners in Network.

8. Program Name:
F.L.A.I.R.

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Santa Paula, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program has served the community since 1985. The program goals are to teach basic English, reading and writing skills for learners in order to raise their job level and standard of living. Information was determined by intake questionnaire and California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Process (CALPEP). Program goals are determined by needs of the community. Program definition of literacy is: the ability to read (comprehend) at the 4th grade reading level.

Nature of Program:
Success of the program can be measured by their reputation in the community. The result of which is continual enrollment without any direct recruitment project. Also, grade level increases in reading, job placement rates/promotion, and changes in learner self-concept. Additionally, learners and tutors are asked informally for information to determine program success.

9. Program Name:
Adult (Dover) Learning Center

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Dover County, New Hampshire

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program goals are to measure basic skills and critical thinking skills, in addition to providing basic skills education. The Staff meets four times a year and develops each years' goals. Different groups and their goals vary according to individual needs, such as, the ESL and job training components.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by grade level increase in reading, post-test scores on standardized test (Test of Adult Based Education), and student interviews. Also, the learners objectives are evaluated-to determine whether they are reaching their goals. Information is collected on administration and curriculum from instructors and from students concerning retention rates. Program was formally evaluated in 1980 by State Adult Education Program which stated that the program was "doing fine."

10. Program Name:
Kern Adult Literacy Council

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Bakersfield, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program goals that are most important are basic skills education and ESL. Program goals are determined by a Planning Committee at the Board. The goals of the student are to learn English, improve their employment and improve self-esteem.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined from continuing enrollment (retention) and from collecting information on student participation rates from instructors.

11. Program Name:
Adult Secondary Programs

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
Houston, Texas

Program Goals/Philosophy:

The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education (first priority), and English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction (second priority). Other goals include, employment/job training (pre-employment instruction), and family literacy. Program definition of literacy is to have reading and math skills at the 8th grade level. Different groups participating in ESL component are taught in incremental fashion so that the students can reach the highest levels of achievement.

Nature of Program:

To determine program success information is collected from instructors on curriculum; service to the community; and students are surveyed once a year. The program also has solid management system. Further indicators of success are course completion rates, continuing enrollment (retention), and survey of students to obtain reactions about their involvement.

12. Program Name:

Fresno Adult Literacy

Program Type:

Community Based Organization

Location:

Fresno, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Program goals are short term; however, major emphasis is on individual's sharing goals. The program helps student design long term goals. The goals are determined from a completed initial assessment. The program's definition of literacy is for learners to be able to read, write and speak English to meet their needs.

Nature of Program:

The program was never evaluated on a formal basis, therefore, the staff do not really understand how successful the program is. However, the program is currently conducting a pilot study on student assessment. To determine success, information is collected from instructors on curriculum materials and graduates are asked if the program helped them meet their goals.

13. Program Name:

Bronx Educational Services

Program Type:

Community Based Organization

Location:

New York, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:

The goals of the program are determined by a staff-mission statement. Most learner goals impact their literacy practice (via training). Also, when learners accomplish goals they enrich their lives.

Nature of Program:

Program success is determined by enrollment increases, continuing enrollment (retention), and the fact that people enjoy being there. Moreover, adults are satisfied and recognition has been received from politicians (Mrs. Bush, organizations, requests to speak). Also, the number of students and hours of instruction are factors which determine success. Program was evaluated by National Diffusion Network (U.S. Department of Education) stating that Bronx Educational Services is exemplary. Also, evaluate in-house by State and City.

14. Program Name:

Central Coast Literacy Council
and Cometa (ESL)

Program Type:

Community College

Location:

Santa Maria, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Program goals are to provide better quality of life. In addition, provide ESL-Amnesty Program, GED preparation, and to help learners function in American society. Goals are determined according to needs of the individual students. The program defined learners as illiterate if reading level fell below the 5th grade. Overall program differs in respect to the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) whose goals are determined by Department of Social Services.

Nature of Program:

To determine if program is successful instructors collect information on student drop out rates and the number of students getting through system. Also, collect information from other agencies Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), and the State Department of Education. Program was formally evaluated by CASAS - State Department of Education.

15. Program Name:

Sweetwater Adult School

Program Type:

Adult Based Education

Location:

Chula Vista, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

The main goals of the program are to provide GED preparation, basic skills education, and ESL. Goals are determined from the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) and Job Training Partnership Acts (JTPA) grants. The program defines literacy as: functional literacy (below 7th grade level as determined by CASAS).

Nature of Program:
Information to determine success is collected from community groups concerning review outcomes, and from other agencies' review outcomes. Moreover success is viewed, by grade level increases in reading, GED passing rates, course completion rates, and job placement rates. Evaluated by State Department of Education every 6 months - named in 1988 by Secretary of Education as an exemplary project.

16. **Program Name:**
Boise State University Adult Literacy

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Boise, Idaho

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program goals are to provide basic skills education, GED preparation, employment/job training, and workplace literacy. Program goals are determined by state plan which reflects goals of adult basic education. The program definition of illiteracy is one reading level below the 8th grade level.

Nature of Program:
To determine success, information is collected from instructors concerning curriculum, and from students to determine if program services are adequate and if they are meeting their goals. Program has been evaluated by Northwest Region (Oregon, Washington) Adult Basic Education Experts.

17. **Program Name:**
Literacy Program

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Los Angeles County Jails; Los Angeles County

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Since 1979, program goals are to serve as many inmates who need instruction. The basic philosophy of the program is to make an impact in family, workplace, and in daily life. In addition, the program provides basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, employment job training, family literacy, vocational education, workplace literacy, and life

skills (daily). Goals are determined by part of districts' Master Plan (L.A. County Sheriff Department and Hacienda-La Puente Unified School District). Program defines literacy as, "reading and understanding the written word in order to function effectively in every day life."

Nature of Program:

Success of program is determined from information collected from: instructors and staff development, workshops; other staff/CBE RAM, etc.; graduates/adult based education certified, GED graduate; "Leavers;" Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA); and community groups/correctional educational. Also information collected from other agencies such as prisons who call on them and other jails. Other indicators of success are course completion rates, continuing enrollment, competency mastery rates, changes in learner self-concept, waiting lists for entrance to class participation, post-test scores, reading level, scoring at the C-CASAS level, and enrolling in ABE program. Program was evaluated by Coop Compliance Review (CCR). Also received recognition from a piece done on California Stories (PBS), "When Grown Ups Can't Read", and WASC 6 years ago.

18. Program Name:

Reading for Life

Program Type:

Library

Location:

San Jose, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Program goals are to reach out to serve constantly, and meet the needs of adults. Also, to provide basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, employment job training, family literacy, vocational education, and provide workplace literacy. Goals are determined by what is needed in community, and the library program is looked to for structure.

Nature of Program:

Success is determined by number of learners contacted by word of mouth, and the number of tutors who get positive feedback from learners. In addition, other indicators of success are course completion rates, enrollment increases, increases in number of tutors, job placement rate, continuing enrollment (retention) competency mastery rates, changes in learner self concept, post-test scores (California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Process-CALPEP). Information relating to success is collected from instructors concerning their general impressions; feedback from learners; graduate's likes and dislikes; and "leavers" reasons for leaving (CALPEP has exit process).

19. Program Name:

East End Literacy

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Toronto, Ontario
Canada

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Main goal is to provide the learning which relates to what student wants. Goals were determined since inception in 1979.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by other staff which evaluates program every year and "leavers" of the program who try to work out problems with staff. Success is also determined by changes in learner self-concept, and asking students if they are getting what they wish from the program. East End hired a group for a formal evaluation in 1982.

20. Program Name:
Project Second Chance

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Pleasant Hill, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
For over four years the program goals were: "To serve portion of Adult Basic Education adults who are not being served by traditional methods employed by community, educational and adult education." In order to meet the needs of the people, the program provides, at no cost, an individualized tutorial program to directly recruit the hard-to-reach adults with literacy needs. Principle goals are determined by the library, grant sources, and staff. Program defines literacy as "one whose basic literacy skills are not at a level to function in the manner which they need or desire in their everyday life"

Nature of Program:
Success is based on tutor pairs, CALPEP, and students who have reached their goals. In addition, information concerning success of the program is collected from: Instructors(regarding satisfactory teaching methods,learner reading level and needs), employers, and students who are satisfied with rate of program. Program was formally evaluated by National Office of the American Library Association.

21. Program Name:
L.A. Library Adult Reading Program

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Primary goals of the program are to focus on basic skills. Goals are determined by grant proposal which require focus on basic skills and from Mission Statement. The program definition of literacy is functional and to develop reading and writing skills.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of success are grade level increases in reading, GED, course completion rates (in terms of Laubach books completed), enrollment increases, increase in the number of staff, continuing enrollment, and changes in learner self-concept. The following information is collected from these groups: instructors(concerning materials), staff (organizational issues), graduates(information concerning affect on their lives), and the community(impact within the community). Formally evaluated in 1985 by the State Library and self-evaluated in 1985.

22. Program Name:
Career Resource Development Center

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
San Francisco, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Serving the community for 22 years. Program provides ESL, employment/job training, vocational, educational, and job placement. Program goals are historically determined, and determined by a board from the Career Resources Development Center.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by job placement rates, student evaluations, advisory committee, students, and employers. Formally evaluated by private firm (currently and two years ago).

23. Program Name:
Huntington Beach Library

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Huntington Beach, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Primary focus is public awareness of program services. Establishing needs for the students is the principle goal. Program definition of literacy is to be functionally literate and to be reading at the 5th grade level, and to enable students to participate productively.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by those students who bring their friends, enrollment increases, and grade level increases. Also from information collected from graduates, tutors, and students. Formally evaluated by Literacy Volunteers of America (LVA) peer monitoring.

24. Program Name:
Focus on Renewal

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Mekees Rock, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goals are basic skills education, and GED Preparation. Goals are determined in response to community needs, and state-mandated goal for the program. Program defines literacy as reading at the 6th grade level.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by grade level increases in reading, and GED passing rates. In addition, information concerning program success is collected from other staff, periodic meetings, Vista students, GED data, found employment, community college enrollment, and instructors/tutors. Monthly tutor meetings are held to determine how students are progressing. Formally evaluated by state; very commendable.

25. Program Name:
Woodland Library Literacy

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Woodland, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
It is important for the program to increase enrollment. Program goals are determined by director (manager) in conjunction with library services which coordinates staff (holds yearly session). The program definition of literacy is to be able to function in everyday life satisfactorily with reading and writing skills.

Nature of Program:

Success is determined by change in learner self-concept, changes in LWR, testimonials of success, and change in learner's lives relating to how much more they can accomplish.

26. **Program Name:**
C.S.U. Human Corps

Program Type:
University

Location:
Long Beach, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goal of program is to embed a commitment of community service into college students matriculation. Overall goals are determined through Human Corp's Task Force.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by requiring reports from each California State campus. Indicators of success are enrollment increases, continuing enrollment, and evaluating community based organizations perceptions of success.

27. **Program Name:**
Computers and Literacy: Jacksonville

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Jacksonville, Florida

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goals are GED preparation, service of pre-ABE students, and building self-confidence. Program goals are determined when the first grant was written and from community needs assessment. Program defines literacy as successfully functioning in society. Overall goals are different for these participants: learner with job change -- goals are learner specific; high school diploma -- learner specific; welfare referred -- motivation is the main goal.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by continuing enrollment (retention) and progress made toward goals. Other factors which contribute to success are information collected from other agencies, referrals to program by those who are satisfied with services, and information from students.

28. **Program Name:**
Delaware County Literacy Council

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Chester, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program's most important goals are Basic Skills Education, and to give the tool of reading to learner. The Board determines program goals from Mission Statement which states "better reading skills to self betterment." The program's definition of literacy is determined by individual learner's goal.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by post-test scores (Slosson Oral Reading Test, Botell), grade level increase, hours of instruction, word recognition, comprehension increases, and tutor/student informal evaluation of the progress. In addition, information concerning success is collected from instructors/tutors regarding the effectiveness of teaching methods and from student's perceptions of progress. Formally evaluated State Department of Education: comments "Glowing good."

29. Program Name:
Project Learn

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Cleveland, Ohio

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The main emphasis of program is to provide learners with the ability to reach their goals. Program goals are informally determined between tutors and students. Program's definition of literacy: Enable students to achieve skills they need and want and to participate effectively in their community.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by continuing enrollment (retention), learner achievement, and LWR lesson completion. Also, information collected from students concerning the program's ability to meet their needs. Two-year evaluation done, students were interviewed by phone (1982-83).

30. Program Name:
English Language Program

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Santa Cruz, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program has served the area for 21 years. Most important goal is English skills education. Program goals are determined by steering committee. Program definition of literacy is Laubach based.

Nature of Program:
The success of program determined by job placement rates, and numbers meeting their goals. Also, from information collected from other agencies--California Literacy Inc. and Marty Lane Video Center. This program has received awards from California Literacy Inc.

31. Program Name:
Mujeres Unidas en Accion

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Boston, Massachusetts

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program goals are to empower woman, provide Spanish education, and create community leadership. Program goals are determined by people who came to the program. These goals were met since 1982. The program's definition of literacy is to become literate enough to meet individual goals. Teaching methods differ for these specific groups: Spanish speaking--Spanish GED; ESL--beginning, intermediate and advanced.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are GED passing rates, enrollment increases, long-range plans, and accomplishment of projects. Also information concerning program success is collected from an advisory board and student evaluations. Overall program evaluations are informal.

32. Program Name:
Watts Adult Education Center (Los Angeles Unified School District)

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

The program's goals are basic skills education, GED preparation, employment/job training, vocational education, and community involvement. Program goals are determined by student needs and those of the community.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by grade level increases in reading, course completion rates, continuing enrollment, and changes in learner self-concept. Additional information to determine success is collected from instructors, other staff, graduates, "leavers," community groups/churches, other agencies and other schools, library programs, and other students.

33. **Program Name:**
Learning Bank of Coil

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
Baltimore, Maryland

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The most important goal of the program is to help adults meet their own aspirations. The program provides basic skills education and GED preparation.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined from information collected from graduates, community groups, other agencies(such as The State Department of Education, Maryland), and from the learners. Formal evaluation by Department of Education, Maryland (Dec. 1988).

34. **Program Name:**
Plan Inc.

Program Name:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Washington, D.C.

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program's most important goals are family literacy and support. The program's overall goals are determined by the Board of Directors.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by increase in the number of staff, continuing enrollment (retention), competency mastery rates, and changes

in people lives. Also, success is determined from information collected from other agencies; and other students. Formally evaluated by National Literacy Project. Has had an outstanding program for the past 4 years.

35. **Program Name:**
YMCA Literacy School

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
San Francisco, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program's most important goals are basic skills education, ESL, and employment/job training. Program goals are determined from needs assessment by students. Program defines literacy as the ability to interact meaningfully with written English.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by enrollment increases, competency mastery rates, changes in learner self-concept, and student feedback. Also, information is collected from: instructors, concerning cultural understanding, graduates, and "leavers", concerning deportation, family, employment, and scheduling problems.

36. **Program Name:**
Spartanburg Aware

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program's most important goal is to provide basic skills education. Overall goals were determined by Founders who wrote the bi-laws in 1977. Program defines illiteracy as: adults that have less than 6th grade reading skills

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by grade level increases in reading, course completion rates, and continuing enrollment (retention). Formally evaluated by Marty Lane (consultant), Santa Barbara. November-January 1989.

37. **Program Name:**
Marin County Library

Program Type:

Library

Location:
Marin County, CA

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The most important goal of this program is to provide basic skills education, and family literacy. Overall goals are determined by grant funding sources. Program defines literacy as being able to read and function in society.

Nature of Program:
Success of program has been determined by grade level increases, staff increases, competency mastery rates, and changes in learner self-concept. State evaluation of program has been provided on a yearly basis, with good results.

38. Program Name:
Lutheran Settlement House Women's Program

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The most important goals of program are to provide basic skills education, student empowerment, and work on self-esteem. Goals are determined by the learners needs. Program defines literacy as: learning to be literate in reading and math while using GED as a guideline. Also, different overall programs for different group needs: ESL--conversational emphasis, J.T.P.A.--Job related needs, Pre-training--7 week classes to enter community college, job training program, or find employment.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by continuing enrollment, and changes in learner self-concept. Also, information collected from instructors concerning attendance, homework completion, and asking students "how do you like it, are you learning?" Coordinator evaluates what is going on in class (Association for Community Based Education). Currently, four classes are being evaluated.

39. Program Name:
Merced Adult School

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Merced, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program's most important goals are to provide basic skills education, and improve life skills education. Goals are set by Board of Trustees together with staff. Program defines skills as survival skills (reading, writing, and math) so learners can achieve personal goals.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by enrollment increases, continuing enrollment, competency mastery rates, post-test scores, and teacher evaluations. Also, information to determine program success is collected from instructors concerning program goals being met from students as they are learning and achieving their goals. The program has been evaluated by the California Compliance Review.

40. Program Name:
Mid-City Adult School (Los Angeles Unified School District)

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Programs most important goals are basic skills education, and ESL and GED preparation. Program goals are determined by Federal requirements-ABE. District goals are developed in consultation with community committee. Program defines literacy as 8th grade reading level (ABE goal).

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by grade level increases in reading, GED passing rates, course completion rates, enrollment increases, increases in number of staff, job placement rates, continuing enrollment, competency mastery rates, changes in learner self-concept, and post-test scores. Formal evaluation by accreditation-adult program.

41. Program Name:
Melmed Learning Clinic

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Lafayette, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goals are basic skills education, employment/job training, family literacy, and workplace literacy. Overall goals

determined by type of clientele. Program defines literacy as: the ability to integrate all of language arts skills including; reading, writing, listening, speaking and understanding.

Nature of Program:
Success was determined by adult interview and information collected from other clients.

42. Program Name:
Adult Learning Center

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
San Francisco, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program's most important goals are basic skill education, employment/job training, and vocational education. Program defines literacy as: meeting student needs and allowing the student to define those elements they need to function in society.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by grade level increases in reading, GED passing rates, course completion rates, and competency gained.

43. Program Name:
Los Angeles Herald Examiner

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goals are ESL, and workplace literacy (primary goal). Program goals are determined over 6 months of discussion using workplace, slides, and discussion of slides. Program defines literacy as: building confidence and gaining respect.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by enrollment increases, continuing enrollment, changes in learner self-concept, and positive student evaluations. Also, information collected from learners and others such as, manager of Los Angeles Times.

44. Program:
Alfabetization

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Lomita, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Most important goals are basic skills education (Spanish), ESL, and adult school entrance. One teacher determines goals. Program defines goals as: better participation in using English by first learning Spanish. Overall program goals differ for certain groups: ESL--help learn English, ALPHA--continue with ABE, Amnestia--Loyola Marymount University teachers finish 40 hours of instruction then continue in English.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined by enrollment, amnesty test passing results, and other test results.

45. Program Name:
Project Read-North County

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Richmond, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program goals determined by staff with learner input, and semi-annual planning meetings with learner. Program defines literacy as: learners being able to function in work and living environments. Learner goals differ with auditory discrimination group.

Nature of Program:
Success determined by enrollment increases, continuing enrollment, and learners meeting their goals. Also, information determining success is collected from exit interviews with learner and follow up phone calls.

46. Program Name:
El Paso Community College Literacy Program

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
El Paso, Texas

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Most important goals are to provide basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, employment/job training, family literacy, vocational education, workplace literacy, and learning disabled program. Goals are determined by survey of students to find why they want to learn to read. Program defines literacy as: working with students who have not developed speaking, writing and reading skills in primary language. Overall program goals differ with vocational--prevocational; for those whose goal is a transition into college; and family literacy--teaching parents to be literate.

Nature of Program:

Success is determined by continuing enrollment (retention), post-test scores (Woodcock), completion rates, information collected from instructors on curriculum, community groups concerning overall program performance, and learners approval regarding services being provided.

47. Program Name:

Lafayette Adult Reading Academy

Program Type:

Community Based Organization

Location:

Lafayette, Indiana

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Most important goal is to improve basic skills according to their learning styles. Overall program goals are determined by the learner. In addition, literacy is defined by the learner.

Nature of Program:

Success is determined if learners achieve specific goals and if the program achieved annual goals stated in State plan. Indicators of success which are used are GED passing rates, job placement rates, and improvement of basic skills and self-esteem. Additionally, information concerning program success is collected from community groups, business & industry, and learner surveys on performance of teachers, staff and use of materials. Formal evaluation by State Department of Education-results was positive.

48. Program Name:

Learning Skills

Program Type:

Community College

Location:

San Jose, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:

The most important goal of the program is for the learner to succeed in college work and vocational education. Thus, the learner must have a basic skills education. Overall goals are determined with the students. Overall program goals differ in respect to vocational education students--to prepare for workplace; academic students--to get them to transfer to a University of California campus.

Nature of Program:

Program success is determined by course completion rates, and competency mastery rates. Also, information concerning program success is collected from instructors about curriculum, and from graduates regarding quality of program. Formally evaluated by College Administration in 1987. The results were positive, growth has been phenomenal, and more space was provided.

49. Program Name:

LINK - Literacy Project

Program Type:

Community Based Organization

Location:

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Primary goals of the program are to provide basic literacy, job training and GED preparation. Program goals are determined by clerical training program - which requires a 6th grade reading level and identify a need to work with unemployed. Program defines literacy as: a person who improves reading and math by a minimum grade level and behavior that is useful for work environment.

Nature of Program:

Success is determined by grade level increases in reading and math, moving on to teaching, GED or employment. Also, information regarding success is collected from instructors concerning teacher observations, and from the program committee, which is responsible for the annual progress report to the board.

50. Program Name:

Greater Pittsburgh Literacy Council

Program Type:

Community Based Organization

Location:

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:

Primary goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, family literacy, and workplace literacy. Program goals are determined by a Committee Board of Directors.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by course completion rates, enrollment increases, continuing enrollment, and post-test scores. Also, information on program success, is collected from instructors, staff, learners, and Board members. The program was formally evaluated by the Health & Welfare Planning Association.

51. Program Name:
Keenan Trust Family Literacy Project

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Louisville, Kentucky

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The most important goals of the program are to teach parents that they are their childrens' first and foremost teachers. This goal is reached through basic skills education, employment/job training, and family literacy. Additionally, parenting skills are stressed so that the learner will become a role model which would improve the relationship between parent and child. The goals are determined by an assessment of adult education and early childhood program.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by grade level increases, and competency mastery rates. Also, information concerning program success is collected from instructors, elementary schools, and from students to recognize whether students are responding to program. Formal evaluations have been done quarterly by a consultant from the University of North Carolina. The results of the evaluation are that the program has provided support, enthusiasm, and involvement in their childrens' schools.

52. Program Name:
Macomb Literacy Project

Program Type:
Library

Location:
Mount Clemons, Michigan

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Since 1984, the program has provided basic skills education. Program goals are determined from community need and by identifying 74,000 people at risk (functionally illiterate below 5th grade level). The

program defines literacy as: being able to function as an independent in the community.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are grade level increases in reading, enrollment increases, increases in number of staff, competency mastery rates, and a waiting list of 80 students. Also, information on program success is collected from instructors/tutors, an advisory board, and from student-support group funding agency.

53. Program Name:
Project Literacy Los Angeles

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The primary goal of program is to improve quality of life for people through basic skills education, GED preparation, and employment/job training. Program goals are determined by the Board of Directors.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are rate of retention, competency mastery rates, and changes in learner self concept. Furthermore, to determine program success, information is collected from instructors, community groups, churches, and the students.

54. Program Name:
Project Read

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
San Francisco (Civic Center), California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The main goal of the program is to provide basic skills, ESL, family literacy, and workplace literacy (now THRUST). An established plan to determine program goals is in place and is modified as needs require. Also, for different groups there are different overall goals. For example, ESL learners, and an LVN program for medical terminology.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are continuing enrollment, retention, and students meeting their goals. Additionally, information pertaining to program success is collected from tutors concerning meetings with students, materials used, and student needs.

55. **Program Name:**
Project Read

Program Type:
Community College

Location:
San Francisco, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills, and student retention. State determines the goals of the program. The program definition of illiteracy is: reading at or below the six grade level.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of success are an increase in number of staff, continuing enrollment (retention), and competency mastery rates. Formal evaluations are quarterly reports given to State, Federal, and State Library officials.

56. **Program Name:**
Ford Park Community Adult School

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Los Angeles, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The programs most important goals are to provide basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, employment/job training, family literacy, and a high school diploma. The goals are determined by the needs of the students. The program definition of literacy is: the ability of students to function competently in the every day world and to be self-sufficient.

Nature of Program:
Program started in a one room class, went on to become an ESL and high school diploma program. Indicators of program success are GED passing rates, retention, and accreditation. The program evaluation came during the accreditation process.

57. **Program Name:**
Tri-County Opportunities Industrialization Center

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:

Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Since 1965, the goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, GED preparation, employment/job training, workplace literacy, and a homeless literacy project. Program goals are determined by an internal needs assessment conducted by director and staff.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are grade level increases in reading, GED preparation, job placement rates, continuing enrollment, and post test scores. Program has been formally evaluated by U.S. Department of Education.

58. Program Name:
Niagara Falls Public Schools

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Niagara Falls, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, employment/job training, vocational education, and an external high school diploma. Program goals are determined by a community needs assessment, and input from Board.

Nature of Program:
Indicators of program success are grade level increases, GED passing rates, course completion rates, job placement rates, continuing enrollment, competency mastery rates, and post-test scores (TABE). Program is evaluated bi-monthly by State Department of Education.

59. Program Name:
Great Neck Adult Learning Center

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Great Neck, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, ESL, employment training, GED preparation, workplace literacy, external high school diploma, and an amnesty program. Community needs assessment is used to determine program goals.

Nature of Program:

Success of program is determined by grade level increases, GED passing rates, job placement rates, continuing enrollment (retention), and post-test scores. Program has been formally evaluated by State Board of Education.

60. Program Name:
York College/Community Learning Center

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Jamaica, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, GED preparation, employment training, ESL, family literacy, vocational education, and workplace literacy. Also, provide programs for specific target population (i.e. single parents, substance abusers). Goals are determined by community needs assessment and student interviews.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by reading level increases, attendance, and student involvement in day-to-day operations. Other indicators of success are GED passing rates, course completion rates, job placement rates, continuing enrollment, competency rates, and post-test scores.

61. Program Name:
Tri-Lite Manufacturing: Administered by the South Bay Union

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Redondo Beach, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Provide skills to earn High School Diploma. To replicate English classes that are offered in high school. Basic skills education, ESL, GED, employment job training, vocational education, workplace literacy, some high school English that teens take (main goal).

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by how much work and learning has been achieved. Additional factors contributing to program success are course completion rates, continuing enrollment(retention), and class room production.

62. Program Name:
The Center for Literacy

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Philadelphia, PA

Program Goal/Philosophy:
CFL serves adults over the age of 16 in Philadelphia who lack the basic reading, writing, and math skills needed to function effectively in every day life. CFL also teaches non-English speaking adults who need basic English language skills. Adult learners set and reach their own education goals.

Nature of Program:
The program serves adults by direct staff involvement, and by training and coordinating volunteers who teach in community-based learning sites. Instruction occurs in one-on-one, small group, or class settings, utilizing both textbooks and student "real life" reading materials.

63. Program Name:
Patrick County Adult Education

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
Stuart, Virginia

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Program primary goals are to provide basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation, family literacy, and workplace literacy. Goals are determined from student and community needs assessment.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by grade level increases, GED passing rates, course completion rates, continuing enrollment (retention), and post-test scores Test of Adult Basic English (TABE). Program evaluations are done by administrative review every 5 years. The last evaluation was done in 1987.

64. Program Name:
Consortium for Worker Education

Program Type:
Adult Based Education

Location:
New York, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide job placement and improvement, and fulfill citizenship requirement. Also, the program provides basic

skills education, ESL, GED preparation, family literacy, workplace literacy, and computer training. The goals are determined by the necessary literacy requirements to maintain a job. The program's definition of literacy is: function in society competently.

Nature of Program:
Success of program is determined by job upgrade, GED passing rates, job placement rates, and post test scores. The program has been formally evaluated by the Center for Advanced Studies in Education (results not given).

65. Program Name:
Playing to Win

Program Type:
Technology

Location:
New York, NY

Program Goals/Philosophy:
Provide access, for low-income people, to computers and computer education. Program offers basic skills education, ESL, GED preparation employment/job training, family literacy, vocational education, and workplace literacy. Program goals are determined by community needs assessment and directors/staff decision.

Nature of Program:
The success of the program is determined by continuing enrollment and retention.

66. Program Name:
Literacy Volunteers of New York

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Bronx, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, family literacy, and leadership development. The students set their individual goals. The program definition of literacy is: a minimum grade level reading.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by course completion rates and grade level increases. Other indicators of program success are continuing enrollment, and post-test scores. The program has been formally evaluated once a year for 2 years, with good results.

67. **Program Name:**
New York Public Library

Program Type:
Library

Location:
New York, New York

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The goals of the program are to provide basic skills education, ESL, family literacy, resources to literacy agencies in NYC, and microcomputer instruction.

Nature of Program:
Success is determined when students reach their own prescribed goals, post-test scores (Test of Adult Basic English-TABE), and meeting of self-assessment goals.

68. **Program Name:**
Adult Literacy Program

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Exton, Pennsylvania

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The program goals are to provide basic skills education, and survival skills. Program goals are achieved through student screening and interviews with students about their aims. The program definition of literacy is: to function in world with reading-related tasks.

Nature of Program:
Program success is determined by an acceptable retention rate, and instructors/tutors always available. Also, information to determine success is collected from family members, and other agencies who have worked with students. Program has been formally evaluated in 1987, by Pennsylvania State Department of Education receiving a 5 (highest rating).

69. **Program Name:**
Metropolitan Adult Education Program

Program Type:
Adult Basic Education

Location:

San Jose, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The primary goal of the program is ESL, basic skills education , GED preparation and vocational education. Program goals are determined by the students.

Nature of Program:
Post-test scores (Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System-CASAS) are used to determine program success. Additionally, staff observations of teachers are used as indicators of success, along with the number of students and number of teachers in program. The program was formally evaluated by the State Department of Education, last year (1988).

70. Program Name:
San Diego Community College

Program Type:
Adult Basic Education

Location:
San Diego, California

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The primary goal of the program is to help the learner function in their adult roles and reach their full potential. Such goals are established through a community needs assessment.

Nature of Program:
Success of the program is determined by post-test scores (CASAS), interviews with tutors and learners, use of California Adult Learner Progress Evaluation Process, and from student confidence increases in what they can do. Also, information about program success is collected from instructors/volunteers concerning training and what is being done with instruction, from "leavers," and from students currently in program.

71. Program Name:
Adult Competency Education

Program Type:
Community Based Organization

Location:
Austin, Texas

Program Goals/Philosophy:
The programs primary goal is to offer basic skills education. Overall program goals are determined by researching learner needs, goals, and interest. Program definition of literacy is to provide instruction to help students and adults in their every day lives.

Nature of Program:

Program success is determined by grade level increases, GED passing rates, competency mastery rates, and by learners being able to read the Bible to their children. Also, in order to determine program success information is collected from instructors, administrators, counselors, and learner. Program was formally evaluated by joint dissemination review panel in 1975, and 1979. Results showed the program to be exemplary.